DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 294 615 JC 880 217

AUTHOR	Noreen, Robert, Ed.
TITLE	Conference on English and Mathematics. Proceedings (October 21-23, 1987, Napa, California).
INSTITUTION	California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.; California State Univ. and Colleges, Long Beach. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE	Oct 87
NOTE	67p.
PUB TYPE	Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Standards; *Articulation (Education); Basic Skills; *College Mathematics; Community Colleges; *English Instruction; Higher Education; Intercollegiate Cooperation; *Mathematics Instruction; State Colleges; *Statewide Planning; Testing Programs; Two Year Colleges; Undergraduate Study
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

The Conference on English and Mathematics brought together 100 faculty members from the California Community Colleges and the California State University to address such topics as curricular standards; admission, placement, and exit testing; improvement of transition from upper- to lower-division study; and the integration of English and mathematics skills. The proceedings include the text of papers presented at the conference, reports on workshops, and recommendations emanating from the event. After background information on the purposes and planning of the conference, Lee Kerschner's keynote address on the promotion of intersegmental cooperation, equity, quality, and efficiency in California postsecondary education is presented with his responses to questions from the audience. After explaining the charges given to conference participants for small group discussions, reports on the following workshops are provided: (1) "Standards and Expectations in English"; (2) "Standards and Expectations in Mathematics"; (3) "Issues of Transfer and Articulation"; (4) "Assessment and Placement in English"; (5) "Assessment and Placement in Mathematics"; and (6) "Integration of English and Math." Next, selected recommendations developed in the workshops are summarized. Finally, John D. Randall, the interim Chancellor of the California Community Colleges highlights pending state legislation with implications for intersegmental cooperation, and W. Ann Reynolds, Chancellor of the California State University, offers closing remarks. (EJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED294615

Proceedings of the Conference on English and Mathematics

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

October 21-23, 1987

Clarion Inn, Napa, CA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
Chancellor's Office

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
Chancellor's Office

JC 880 217

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE ACADEMIC SENATE
For California Community Colleges

May 11, 1988

Dear Colleague,

Last October 21-23, 1987, the California Community Colleges and the California State University jointly sponsored a conference for faculty in English and mathematics. The purpose of the conference was to initiate dialogue between our two faculties and to develop recommendations for future collaborative projects between our two segments. Articulation of course standards, preparation, and assessment of skills between our segments is essential for a strong and viable transfer function.

In followup to the conference, joint proposals for regional efforts between our faculties were solicited. Five proposals were selected for funding, including a regional math and English articulation conference at Cal Poly, Pomona; a workshop on standards and expectations in English in San Bernardino area; the development of course descriptions for mathematics courses in the California Articulation Number (CAN) System; the development of a course to prepare students for the upper division writing requirement in San Jose; and a collaborative English project in the Sacramento region.

Since participation in the conference had to be limited, the enclosed conference proceedings were published to share the issues and recommendations which were discussed during the conference. We hope the proceedings are informative and will spur additional collaborative efforts on the local and regional level.

The Joint CCC-CSU Conference in English and Mathematics is an important first step in the initiation of joint projects between our faculties. We look forward to continuing the interest developed at the conference by initiating other joint projects. We welcome your comments and suggestions.

Sincerely,

Karen Sue Grosz

Karen Sue Grosz, President
Academic Senate for the
California Community Colleges

Frieda Stahl

Frieda Stahl, Vice-Chair
Academic Senate, The
California State University

cc: Jack D. Randall
James Meznek
Ronn W. Farland
Gus Guichard
W. Ann Reynolds
Lee Kerschner

1107 Ninth Street • Sacramento, CA 95814 • (916) ~~445-5465~~ 445-4753

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

2. Conference Planning Committee

3. The Plan for the Conference

5. The Conference Program

6. Welcoming Remarks: Karen Sue Grosz.

8. Keynote Speech: Lee Kerschner

13. Questions from the floor for Dr. Kerschner

16. Plenary Session: The Charge to the Participants

23. Workshop 1-A: The Curriculum: Standards and Expectations in English

29. Workshop 1-B: The Curriculum: Standards and Expectations in Mathematics

33. Workshop 2: Issues of Transfer and Articulation

36. Workshop 3-A: Strategies for Assessment and Placement in English

40. Workshop 3-B: Strategies for Assessment and Placement in Mathematics

44. Workshop 4: Integration of English and Mathematics Skills

48. Summary of the Recommendations of the Conference

53. Keynote Remarks: John D. Randall, Interim Chancellor, California Community Colleges

58. Closing Remarks: W. Ann Reynolds, Chancellor, California State University

61. Questions from the floor for Dr. Reynolds

APPENDIX

63. List of Conference Participants
65. Conference Bibliography

CONFERENCE PLANNING COMMITTEE

California State University:

Philip Emig, Northridge

Allison Heisch, San Jose

Robert Noreen, Northridge

Frieda Stahl, Los Angeles

Robert Stein, San Bernardino

California Community Colleges:

Arthur Dull, Diablo Valley College

Karen Sue Grosz, Santa Monica College

James Prager, Yuba College

Lloyd Thomas, Los Angeles Community College District

Shirley Trembley, Bakersfield College

CSU Administrative Staff:

Frank Young,
CSU Chancellor's Office

Ken Simms,
CSU Chancellor's Office

Edward Borowiec,
CSU Chancellor's Office

CCC Administrative Staff:

Connie Anderson,
CCC Chancellor's Office

Stuart Van Horn,
Mt. San Antonio College

Conference Co-Chairs: Karen Sue Grosz and Frieda Stahl

Editor of Conference Proceedings: Robert Noreen

THE PLAN FOR THE CONFERENCE

The recent debate on the revision of the California Master Plan for Higher Education has focused new attention on strengthening transfer and assuring that students have access to comparable learning experiences in all segments of public postsecondary education.

During 1986-87, representatives of the California Community Colleges and the California State University met frequently to discuss how issues related to the transfer problem and other common concerns might be most effectively addressed. Academic leaders in both systems recommended that initial attention be directed toward the problem of sequencing and content mastery of basic skills in English and mathematics.

In April 1987, a conference planning committee was formed made up of representatives from the disciplines of English and mathematics in both systems, as well as representatives from the respective Chancellors' Offices. Karen Sue Grosz, Santa Monica College, and Frieda Stahl, CSU, Los Angeles, were named as co-chairs of the conference.

The planning committee met throughout the summer to develop a conference program that would cover such subjects as curricular standards in English and mathematics; the role of assessment for admission, placement, and exit; improvement of transition from lower to upper division study; and the integration of English and mathematics skills. One hundred faculty leaders in English and mathematics, fifty from each system, were invited to participate. These faculty members were identified as having expertise that would contribute materially to the discussion of the issues.

This conference signals the inauguration of closer communication and collaboration between the California Community Colleges and the California State University. We expect that these efforts will allow us to work more closely on issues of joint interest, to improve the transfer process, and to enhance articulation of courses between our respective systems. It is only through our collaborative efforts that the vision of the revised Master Plan for Higher Education in California will become a reality.

THE CONFERENCE PROGRAM

Wednesday, October 21, 1987

6:30 p.m.	Welcoming Banquet
	Conference Welcome Karen Sue Grosz and Frieda Stahl, Conference Co-Chairs
	Conference Keynote Address Lee R. Kerschner, Vice-Chancellor, Academic Affairs, CSU
	"Toward Unity, Equity, Quality and Efficiency in California Postsecondary Education"

Thursday, October 22

9:00 - 10:00 a.m.	Plenary Session
	General presentation of conference issues. The charge to the workshops.
10:00 - 12:00	Workshop Sessions I-IV
	I: The Curriculum: Standards and Expectations I-A: English I-B: Mathematics II: Issues of Transfer and Articulation III: Strategies for Assessment and Placement III-A: English III-B: Mathematics IV: Integration of English and Math Skills
12:00 - 1:30 p.m	Buffet Lunch
2:00 - 4:00 p.m.	Workshop Sessions I-IV (second sections)

Friday, October 23

9:00 - 9:30 a.m	Keynote Remarks John D. Randall, Interim Chancellor, CCC
9:30 - 11:00 a.m.	Plenary Session: Workshop Reports Discussion of Workshop Recommendations
12:00 - 1:30 p.m.	Luncheon and Closing Address W. Ann Reynolds, Chancellor, CSU

CONFERENCE WELCOME

Karen Sue Grosz, Conference Co-Chair

It is a particular delight for me to welcome you to this joint faculty conference on English and mathematics. With the Master Plan Commission and Joint Legislative Committee recommendations as a backdrop to this meeting, we find ourselves in an environment of change and re-assessment. To be able to discuss our common concerns and share visions of academic standards and course expectations should be especially productive.

The Master Plan Commission recommendations reflect statewide concerns with such issues as admissions requirements, articulation, cooperative curriculum development in secondary and postsecondary segments, and transfer rates from community colleges to the University of California and the California State University. Specifically, the Master Plan Commission suggests the development of a transfer general education curriculum, and AB 1725 (Vasconcellos) repeats that suggestion in the form of statutory mandate. The development of such a lower-division general education transfer curriculum is currently being undertaken by a committee of the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates of the UC, the CSU, and the Community Colleges. This single item embodies most if not all of the concerns to be addressed at this conference, for it involves a recognition of academic standards and student expectations, it depends upon accurate assessment and placement, and it necessitates the inter-relation of various skills. Furthermore, the development of a transfer general education curriculum can have a far-reaching impact in terms of improving and facilitating student movement among the segments. Since a significant number of our students are concurrent enrollees, sometimes referred to as "reverse transfers" from the four-year segments to the community colleges, a common general education curriculum is an even more urgent concern in both segments. Thus, we in the Academic Senates are especially supportive of the work of the Transfer General Education Committee chaired by Carmen Decker (Cypress College) and look forward to the final development of that committee's work.

The Master Plan Commission also includes a number of recommendations related to academic quality. The Commission argues that

Especially at the lower-division level... the undergraduate curriculum is too often fragmented and incoherent. Effective teaching and learning depend in part on the existence of a coherent rationale underlying the undergraduate curriculum. Faculty must know how the courses they teach serve the intellectual development of their students, and students need a fundamental understanding of why they

study a particular subject within the larger whole. Campuses must establish clear curricular objectives, match curricular development to those objectives, and institutionalize systematic evaluation of program and individual curricular offerings.

The Master Plan Commission might appear to fly in the face of a comment purportedly made by a college president to new part-time faculty that they are the kings of their classrooms, free to do as they wish. And there are some faculty members who fear that any curricular review might result in conformity and standardization to the point where a professor would lose all control over course content and presentation. Obviously, a middle ground must be sought: the curricula must be examined periodically to ensure that they are current; class presentations must have some degree of conformity with course objectives; course goals must be made clear to students. Without such review on a periodic and systematic basis, we run the risk of academic anarchy, a situation which may provide a high level of short-term gratification for both faculty and students, but which will not serve either students or the institutions in the long run.

Academic anarchy, however, can be an intersegmental as well as an intracampus reality. How often have we heard the apocryphal comment that the University of California does what the University of California wants, without concern for the rest of the world? And how often have we heard the equally apocryphal comment that the community colleges have no consistency, no academic standards? Having sat for more than two years on the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates, I know first hand that atleast some of the UC faculty do have concerns for the rest of the world. And of course the community colleges have standards and a degree of consistency, however minimal that might be. But we must all remember our roles in articulating our needs. Through conferences such as this we can share concerns and strategies. Eventually it might be productive to attempt a conference such as this with all three segments participating.

I am increasingly convinced that educators are superior potentialists. Who but a potentialist, for example, would give so much attention to the basic skills needs of college students? Having ourselves experienced the fascination of learning, we find ourselves committed to the pursuit of instilling in others that fascination with learning, in the hope that they will realize their potential. In planning this conference, the members of the planning committee engaged in sometimes lengthy discussions of the interrelated aspects of English and mathematics, and as we talked, we realized the potential for this conference. We hope that you will share our interest in moving across the disciplines to share our insights, analyze areas of concern, and work toward improvement of higher education in California.

Keynote Address

Dr. Lee Kerschner,

Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs

California State University

Frieda Stahl: Introduction of Dr. Kerschner

At this time it is my personal and professional pleasure to introduce our keynote speaker, Dr. Lee Kerschner, CSU Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. I cannot resist the observation that math faculty and English faculty have gathered together here for a very significant "academic affair." Lee Kerschner has returned to the California State University system after a long tour elsewhere. As faculty members say in a cliche expressing their approval, Lee got "chalk on his hands" at Cal State Fullerton as a professor of political science. He also was an academic senator on his campus and the systemwide academic senate and was elected to office in each. He then moved into our "central shed"--which faculty would not regard as a move up if it weren't for the salary--and served first as CSU Dean of Faculty and later as Assistant Executive Vice-Chancellor. He left California for the greener fields and snowier peaks of Colorado, where he was director of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education. Returning to sun and smog a couple of years ago, he served as executive director of the Commission for the Review of the California Master Plan for Higher Education. His superlative leadership on that body has culminated in the report now under consideration by John Vasconcellos' Legislative committee. Its implementation and funding will carry us further in the twenty-first century than our previous plan did in the twentieth. Please join me in welcoming Lee Kerschner, who, with chalk on his hands, will address us on the theme, "Toward Unity, Equity, Quality, and Efficiency in California Postsecondary Education."

Dr. Kerschner's address:

Frieda, thank you. I appreciate being here and the hard work you and the committee have put into this project. I would like to spend some time this evening talking about the Master Plan and put it into context for you.

In 1984, Senator Nielson sponsored SB1570, which created the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education and outlined the scope of the Master Plan review. Simultaneously with that, Senator Stiern sponsored SB2064 which

directed the Commission to begin its study with a reassessment of the California Community Colleges. At the same time, Assemblywoman Hughes sponsored a concurrent resolution that created the legislative joint committee for the review of the Master Plan. And all that reflects significant legislative infighting. The first bill stressed that the Master Plan should not be looked at by the Legislature, but by lay citizens. The second reflected the concern of many, particularly those in CSU and UC, that the problem is clearly with the community colleges, so why not focus on the community colleges? The community colleges, by the way, shared that view. This Master Plan was in many ways created by community college needs and concerns and by community college leadership. Assemblywoman Hughes' bill to create the joint legislative committee was the result of a conviction that no blue ribbon commission, primarily a lay citizen commission, could produce a bill that wasn't subject to legislative review. So now we have the joint legislative committee chaired by John Vasconcellos which is reviewing our material.

I came in the spring of 1985 and began immediately on the community college study. We did it with monthly meetings, with advisory committees, we had students, faculty and administrators, and staff research papers. It was an issues-based process which enabled us to put absolutely outrageous ideas on the table without owning them. We would develop an issue and put out all the possible public policy solutions to that issue. And the commissioners would wrestle from that. Then the cries from the special interest groups would go up, "Oh, my God! Have you heard what they are thinking of now!" And I would say, "Sure, but we are just thinking of all these things." So, we had all of these issues on the table. It resulted in some excellent discussions. But it had a downside. And that is, that lay citizens, like most of us, do not like to alienate groups. When you lay out a spectrum of options, the tendency is to go to the middle. So you end up with incremental change instead of radical change. You will find that both Challenge of Change, the document on the community colleges, as well as the Master Plan, are essentially incremental documents, not radical documents--at least not in my judgment. There are some in the community colleges who might argue about some portions of that statement.

The bulk of the recommendations in Challenge of Change have been incorporated into Assembly Bill 1725 with two major exceptions. One was a strong recommendation on redoing the governing structure of the colleges, making it more central, and the other was a recommendation for revising the financial structure of the community colleges. Both are missing from AB1725, and will undoubtedly continue to be negotiated over this coming session.

One of the highlights of Challenge of Change, for which we had full support from the community colleges, was the notion that access without some modicum of success is a charade. In order to have access in the community colleges, you had to have rigorous assessment, counseling, placement, and follow-up. Just because you were admitted to the institution did not mean that you were admitted to History 101, if you couldn't read and write and do mathematics at the collegiate level. So it is a very strong pitch for what the community colleges call matriculation, a perfectly good word which has been ruined by the community colleges; we call it assessment-counseling-placement-and-followup, but it is a great idea, and it is absolutely critical to the future of those institutions, and to the State of California.

You will see as we move on to discuss the Master Plan itself, that the community colleges are a key part of that Master Plan. There are a lot of recommendations in Challenge of Change which I will not be able to discuss because they are too detailed, but two others I would like to mention.

The first is the recommendation that the governance of the community colleges at the campus level be reflected in a manner suitable to postsecondary educational institutions; essentially it would empower community college academic senates to behave like academic senates. I did have some support for that recommendation from Karen Sue Grosz and Mark Edelstein, as you might expect, and from other faculty who are involved in the process of campus governance.

The second is the recommendation that we ought to take the notion of 2+2+2 programs seriously.

This recommendation is a little hobby of mine, and I share it with you now, so that you will know I have a bias in that regard. In effect, it stipulates that when students who have taken vocational courses in the community colleges suddenly discover that they can learn, that they can do college-level work, we should not close the door on them. We ought to find a method of carrying them on to baccalaureate degrees, and we ought to do that openly and with support. I am of the naive view that if we offer nursing and computer science, and industrial technology at the baccalaureate level in a four year institution, that just because you call them vocational programs in the two year institutions doesn't change the nature of what is being done. Now, this might not be a very academic way of looking at things, but the 2+2+2 is an important issue for me, and it will undoubtedly be reflected from time to time in CSU attitudes, I hope.

Let me talk now about the Master Plan itself. We went through a similar process for the Master Plan, starting in April 1986. We had major speakers, lots of public hearings, issue papers, etc.; we had a faculty advisory committee and we had staff and student advisory committees, all of which helped enormously in this process.

In the course of reviewing the Master Plan, several things became clear. First, the changing demographics of this state became the salient issue for the Master Plan itself. That is to say, we will be dealing with an entirely different type of student body and that student body change is going to be very rapid. It will continue well into the twenty first century. Secondly, we tried to identify the major problems facing the state in making the Master Plan effective. We identified several which I will summarize:

1. The weakness of the community college governance structure and the refusal of the legislature to grant the Board of Governors enough independence from the state bureaucracy and to delegate policy making and financial planning appropriate to a postsecondary educational institution. The community colleges have got to be a third strong segment.

2. The decline of the transfer system. This decline must be reversed, and that is clearly a faculty problem. (I am going to note here as we go through, all the recommendations that depend on the faculty. I do that very deliberately, because the effectiveness of the Master Plan is really in the hands of the faculty.)

3. The failure of the many well-intentioned programs and initiatives to establish true equity on the public campuses. That, too, is very much in the hands of the faculty.

4. An absence of effective long-range planning for segmental and system-wide growth.

5. A failure among the four year institutions to effectively balance the growing prestige of university research with serious and sustained attention to the quality of undergraduate instruction. Clearly, this is a problem for the faculty.

6. The inadequacy of the 1960 Master Plan provisions regarding the development of joint doctoral programs and the ambiguity as to the research role of the California State University. Clearly this is an issue, partially in the hands of the faculty and partially in the hands of the legislature.

7. Lack of attention for insuring that the actual and potential contributions of the private sector are taken into account.

8. And the absence of a body responsible to provide the linkage to establish unity, equity, quality, and efficiency.

Let us discuss unity, for a moment.

First, we recommended that the California Education Round Table become a voluntary body responsible for providing the operational linkage for the state's educational systems. And, that there be created under it, the ICC, the Intersegmental Coordinating Council, a staff group supporting the voluntary operational cooperation of the three segments. I am pleased to note that the new staff director of that group is sitting here, Mark Edelstein.

We also recommended that the missions of the public and private segments be restated or clarified--the state university in respect to research, the community colleges and the high schools in respect to vocational education. (Let me digress for a second, even though it may not be important for all of you: one of the problems we face is that high school vocational education in this country is in a shambles. We have young people who are learning ideas and skills that are no longer germane to the market. They come out of these programs too young to get jobs, they are at a dead-end, and they can't transfer. Our recommendation is essentially that the high schools should get out of vocational education. That recommendation was not well-received, but, nevertheless, I think it is important.)

We recommended that there be a unified admission and transfer system that makes the policies of 1960 work. We are talking about a restoration of the 40/60 enrollment pattern--that is 40% of the undergraduates in the California State University and the University of California would be lower division and 60% would be upper division. We are also talking about ease of transfer. We believe that, with the reforms we have recommended, the community colleges have both the physical and the academic capacity to absorb the large increase in lower division enrollment. The Commission talked about "transfer" but that is not what we meant. What we meant was "progress through the system." We are talking about the right of a student who enters a community college to have the same right to obtain a baccalaureate degree as any other student entering any other postsecondary segment in this state. That is a major distinction. We meant it. We asked that the transfer function be recognized by the governor, by the legislature, and by the intersegmental boards as a central priority for all three segments of postsecondary education. We want guaranteed access to the baccalaureate degree for all qualified Californians who want to work toward that degree.

We recommended equal treatment of native and transfer students. By that we mean that we must develop a transfer core curriculum and articulation agreements--which is at the heart of what this conference is about: it is in your hands and only in your hands. State agencies and blue ribbon commissions come and go, and we can articulate the best goals, but unless the faculty cooperate, get together, and reach agreement on what classes, and courses, and curriculum mean, it is not going to happen. So I leave that problem with you, and tell you that I am delighted you are meeting to discuss these issues.

We again reiterated the role of a strong Board of Governors in revitalizing the community colleges.

Let us now turn to equity. Our systems have spent millions on equity--we are focusing on equity all the time, but we have made precious little progress. Partially, this is the case because, in our judgment, equity can no longer be in the hands of seven people in a quonset hut on the edge of campus. Equity is a campus wide responsibility, and it has got to be a campus-wide responsibility. The faculty are as responsible for equity as anyone else. That means in our hiring, that means in supporting students, that means in moving this state to a functioning multilingual and multi-cultural society. We are going to be a multi-lingual, multicultural society at the turn of this century--the question before the house and the question before you is whether we are going to be a functioning one. I would suggest that equity is an integral part of that process.

With equity, we are talking about improvement of retention rates, we are talking about recruitment of faculty, we are talking about getting additional faculty in the pipeline, we're talking about better use of what we call the natural pipeline. I was stunned to find out--pleased, but stunned--that the University of California has a number of agreements with traditionally black colleges in the South to take students from those colleges up to Berkeley and other campuses for graduate degrees. I said in my naive kind of way that I thought that was a good idea. But why not Dominguez Hills and Cal State, L.A.? We'd be happy to have that kind of agreement for our system, and I'm pleased to note that such discussions are now in progress. We have got to start producing our own faculty from our own resources if we are going to establish a more diverse faculty in the next twenty years and if we are going to do that in any broad kind of way.

Let us talk about quality. The Commission was concerned about our ability to provide quality

education in California from kindergarten through graduate school. The Commission believed that postsecondary institutions have to make education in the public schools and the education of the public school teacher their highest priority. If we are going to survive as a society, we have to solve the public school problem. Now I had one physicist Ph.D. commissioner who said that until the dropout rate becomes as important as the neutrino, society is doomed. Now, you'll forgive him, but I have to tell you that the Commissioners were absolutely committed to the notion that we have a responsibility to the public schools. The community colleges share that responsibility as do the four year institutions; such a commitment will include faculty outreach, it will include providing support for faculty activities, it willl include making sure that the faculty are compensated for those activities, that they are reflected in RPT processes, etc.

We talked about the coherence of the undergraduate program, and we talked about the need to advance general education. We made some recommendations on general education, only one of which I want to mention here because it was my own pet project. I believe that the State University and the University of California should require by the end of the century that everyone in the system should be competent in a second langauge prior to graduation. I feel very strongly about that one, and the Commissioners were willing to say that that should be considered even though they weren't willing to make it mandatory. It is clearly in the Master Plan, and it is clearly an important issue.

We talked about faculty teaching being given the greatest weight in the State University system in promotion and retention processes. That is clearly in the hands of the faculty. If we are going to do something about enhancing the quality of undergraduate teaching, it is something you all are going to have to do.

The Commission also talked about efficiency. I won't take the time to review the efficiency recommendations, except to note that the commissioners were quite concerned that the formulas which drive the budgets in this state be equitable and fair, based on role and missions. The Commissioners felt that they are not equitable and fair. There was also a feeling that the community colleges are significantly underfunded. I believe they are, but there was also the feeling in our discussions that the underfunding of the community colleges is never going to be resolved until the governance issue of the community colleges is resolved and the community colleges stop looking like 106 institutions, all falling over themselves trying to get funds from the state, while the CSU and UC are clearly able to unify their budgetary approaches.

If I had to select a central theme of the Master Plan, I would say it is that the community colleges are the key to an effective Master Plan for Higher Education in California. If our community colleges are not successful, then this state has the most elite system of higher education in the country. No other state university takes only the upper third of high school graduates. Ohio State until last year took anyone with a "C" average. We have consistently asserted that our "open door" is the community colleges. The Commissioners believe that the concept of transfer is essential to making the Plan work: effective, clear, easy, comprehensive, student movement between sectors, without building in unnecessary barriers. That is in the hands of the faculty. You have to understand that lay citizens look at these things somewhat differently than faculty do.

Transfer is at the heart of this Master Plan and at the heart of what we are going to do the rest of this century, and it is at the heart of equity in this state, if we are going to change the very nature of the State of California. We are going to do it, and do it with effective community colleges and effective transfer programs. Easy progression through the system will come about only through effective transfer programs. Effective transfer programs will only come about through articulation between the systems. The key to articulation is in the hands of the faculty, and that is you, and I wish you the very best of luck in doing it.

Questions from the audience:

1. You have wrestled with the differences among the Community College boards in 70 different districts with 70 different salary schedules. Have you come up with any way of dealing with all these differences?

We did wrestle with that issue. We concluded that rather than create a completely unified system, which is what solving those differences would imply, we would instead strengthen the Board of Governors so that they might set policy with regard to academic and financial matters. We would leave individual bargaining--faculty salaries, schedules, etc.--at the local district level. We would thus leave the local districts in place. The local districts would still be responsible for the hiring and firing of presidents, except that we did include the provision that local presidents would be subject to confirmation by the Board of Governors. It is very unlikely that there would be a statewide salary schedule for all community college instructors.

2. The Master Plan calls for a transfer core curriculum. What exactly does this mean?

The basic idea of a transfer core curriculum is that students could complete their lower division requirements with 56 units at a community college and could be guaranteed transfer to any other school in higher education, having completed their lower division work. Students won't have to worry that if they were planning to go to Davis and then decide to go to Fresno, they won't have a foul-up in their plans. The CSU honors such transfer now, but the UC does not. The revised Master Plan will provide more stability and consistency. The transfer core curriculum developed mutually by the three Academic Senates of the higher education systems will carry a great deal more weight and will provide a sense of stability for the student and will make ease of transfer between the systems possible.

3. The Community Colleges now have fewer specific requirements for lower division than the CSU. We are concerned about this.

The Master Plan does not require that the courses within the two systems be identical. It does say that the CSU and the UC must give full credence or full faith and credit to the certification of the community college.

4. What do you mean by the "different" students that California will have in the future. Will these "different" students require a different faculty?

I believe that the student body mix will look very different at the end of this century than it looks now. I believe that the faculty will have to be as representative of that mix as the students are. We are in deep trouble on that issue. I think that it is going to be very hard to do that, and we are going to be in intense competition nationwide. There are very few minority and ethnic language faculty in the pipeline now. We are working very hard on this at the CSU with special scholarship support. But frankly we are going to have to start in the sixth grade and try to help students to see that an academic career is a viable option. One of the chief competitions we are going to have is from professional careers. I can understand that: quicker rewards, more independence, less subject to judgments by other people. There is going to be a lot of competition in that arena, and we must be successful in that competition so that we will have a set of role models on our faculty, and a faculty that represents the society. This is an issue at the highest priority of what we are doing right now.

5. What are your thoughts on the recommendation regarding an academic floor for the community colleges?

The commission dealt with the academic floor question at great length over a series of several meetings and a number of public hearings. Largely, as a result of community college interests, pressure, and education, and as a result of some of my own biases, the notion of the academic floor was put aside. We were unable to find an academic floor that still preserved an open door. However, if you will look at assessment, counseling, placement, and follow-up, what you have are multiple floors that are far

more equitable. It says to a student, "If you can come into this institution, and can perform at the collegiate level in a hands-on program, you are welcome, but until you are counseled and placed and found to be proficient, particularly in English and math, you will have to take remedial work." My sense is, and the Commission's sense is, that that is by far the fairest thing to do. The slogan we developed at the time is "Access without success is meaningless."

6. Don't the Community Colleges need help to further develop a faculty with expertise in remedial teaching?

That is a very interesting question, and I am not prepared to answer it. I can only tell you that in a series of three public hearings, the Community Colleges asserted that not only are they able to provide remedial work, but that they are able to do it far better than the public Adult Schools. (At which point the Adult Schools stood up and said they had the expertise and the Community Colleges didn't.) Little evidence was presented for either side. I believe the Community colleges can do it. I believe it is absolutely startling what community colleges can do with students who are not otherwise eligible for the four year institutions. Some schools have excellent remedial programs.

7. Right now the CSU accepts transfer students coming with general studies in math and English but who have not taken the EPT or ELM. If the number of these students increase, are we going to be able to assume that we can still accept them without these entry level exams?

If you take a look at what is happening to the high schools as a result of the new CSU admissions standards, you will find that the number of students taking the new pattern is increasing dramatically. The preparation of the high school student should improve, and we can expect this to continue. The critical issue is whether a student who enters the community college system under lower admissions standards has achieved the same preparation, when he transfers to the CSU or UC, as the high school student who enters the CSU directly under higher admission standards. We will have to see how that plays out. Previous evidence is that two years of maturity and 56 units means a lot. When a student does transfer, he is a fairly committed student. We should note that the dropout rate of transfer students who proceed on to earn the B.A. is less than that of native students, so those who do transfer, come with a high degree of motivation.

8. Comment by participant: We must realize that in California we are living in a multicultural and a multilinguistic society. As a native of India, I know what a multicultural society is, having lived in a land of 40 cultures and 28 languages. We must not lose sight of the need, however, to have one common, functional language.

Yes, we are living in a multicultural and multilinguistic society. Language plays a dominant and significant role in our lives; English is so deeply entrenched here, that I don't see it ever losing its role as the central functional language, despite the fact that, increasingly, students with various language backgrounds are entering our schools. We live in an interdependent world, and there are enormous resources at our disposal in a multicultural world. We must send out the message that speaking a second langauge is a good thing. We should certainly encourage our native speakers to learn another language, and we ought to demand that our non-English speakers learn English. Our graduates ought to be bilingual. One of the languages should be English, but they ought to be bilingual. And our universities ought to encourage students to learn other languages than those that have been popular in the past. We need to increase enrollments in those languages of the Pacific Rim. We can't continue into the twenty-first century with our present second language learning patterns; you can't look at China today and say that everyone ought to continue to learn German. We need to be more realistic about our needs.

The strength of our country is built on immigrants. The fervor of creativity in the arts and the developments in the sciences in our country have been

heavily immigrant driven. We must remember that with few exceptions those involved in the Manhattan Project were all immigrants. We are an immigrant country and California is at the forefront in assimilating immigrants. There is great strength, excitement, and fervor in our immigrant groups and we should capitalize upon it.

OPENING PLENARY SESSION:

THE CHARGE TO THE PARTICIPANTS

Summary: *The opening plenary session on Thursday morning began with an introduction by the conference co-chair, Karen Sue Grosz. Following this introduction, co-chair Frieda Stahl gave the charge to the conference participants by reading the statements that describe the focus of each workshop. Questions from the audience followed.*

Karen Sue Grosz:

We heard last night a speech by Dr. Kerschner on the theme of "Unity, Equity, Quality and Efficiency." Interestingly enough, those are exactly the points we anticipate for the rest of this conference with reference to English and mathematics. We certainly see a unity in English and mathematics (and I'll talk a little more about that in a moment); we certainly feel that there is a necessity for equity, we obviously feel a great push for quality, and everyone recognizes the necessity for efficiency. So all of these points apply to the conjunction of English and mathematics.

Frieda Stahl has been known to say that English and mathematics skills are the sine qua non of the educational process. Without one, a person cannot adequately or fully pursue the other. Most people first approach this by saying that unless one can write well, one cannot calculate, because much of calculation is posed in sentence format. I would like to argue that it goes the other way, and I am going to make a bold attempt to do that this morning. In any case, it is clear that unless one can write and calculate it is difficult to pursue any other discipline.

The interrelation between English and mathematics skills was discussed at some length by the Conference Planning Committee as we met to decide how we would set up these workshops. We recognized immediately that the need for reasoning skills in calculation is linguistic. As I mentioned a moment ago, mathematics requires a basic expository analysis, and that analysis presumes a training in English skills as well as

in calculation procedures. That means, then, that math students must pay attention to expository prose skills. Although mathematicians are sometimes accused of going off into the realm of the fantastic, the math student rarely has need for creative writing skills, but very definitely has an immediate need for expository writing skills.

The fundamental processes in abstract conceptualization which are essential in mathematics, then, are rooted in English. The most successful students are able to externalize these processes. The students, on the other hand, who find mathematics difficult, most often need additional English skills--something that many English faculty members don't recognize or have not thought about.

On the other side, modern linguistics is highly mathematical. Every mathematician knows that an equation is a sentence. It has a syntax. How many English instructors have stopped to realize the mathematical underpinnings of the sentence? Everytime I introduce the dreaded topic of diagramming the sentence, I tell my students (and, by the way, I make such assignments strictly voluntary!) that this is another way of looking at the structure of grammar, and it is mathematical. There is only one spot in a diagram for each word in the sentence, and although a word may have several different uses within the English language--to be used, for example, as a noun, adjective, adverb, or verb--within a diagram that word has only one spot or one function.

There is, however, a third basic skill which represents the merging point of English and mathematics, and that is critical thinking. Until a student is able to analyze and synthesize, until a student reaches that point of critical thinking, there isn't a real blending or a real meeting of English and mathematics skills.

Frieda Stahl:

The workshops that the Planning Committee finally decided upon as being appropriate for this conference have some distinct charges that I would like to place before you.

The charges are as follows:

WORKSHOP 1-A:
"Standards and Expectations in English"
Robert Noreen and Lloyd Thomas, leaders

The statewide academic senates of the CCC and CSU have approved a statement on the competencies in English expected of entering freshmen. Part of the statement on writing skills is as follows:

College and university faculty expect students to be able to understand, organize, synthesize, and communicate information, ideas, and opinions. Students must also be able to make critical judgments, to distinguish primary and relevant ideas from those that are subordinate or irrelevant. Students will be required in college courses to demonstrate these abilities by writing compositions, reports, term papers, and essay examinations. Because the learning process, as well as the quality of the student's written work, depends upon these abilities, it is crucial that these abilities be developed before students enter college.

As college and university teachers, should we assume that such preparation is taking place? Is this the starting point for our freshman English course, or our goal for its end? Should we, as college and university teachers, prepare a statement that would reflect achievements exceeding those suggested by the above statement? Are our resources adequate to realize our expectations?

WORKSHOP I-B:
"Standards and Expectations in Mathematics"
Art Dull and Philip Emig, leaders

In three recent documents: The Model Curriculum Standards, adopted by the State Board of Education, 1985; Promises to Keep, adopted by C.P.E.C., 1983; and Competencies in English and Mathematics Expected of Entering Freshmen, adopted by the academic senates of the CCC and the CSU, 1982 (currently under revision) we find the following three statements:

"To accommodate changes in the way in which, and the extent to which, mathematics is used in our society, we must raise the expectations we have for our graduates."

"Among nine priorities it (CPEC) identified for action by the postsecondary community over the next five years were improvement of student preparation and improvement of student skills."

"The mathematics curriculum in high school and college consists of sequences of courses, each with specific topics to be learned to enable students to build upon their skills and understanding of mathematical operations."

As college teachers, should we assume that such preparation is taking place? Are standards and expectations what we want them to be? How do we foster analytical and critical thinking skills? What competencies are needed? Is there a knowledge base of lower division needed, standards required, critical thinking skills necessary for the entering freshman among ourselves and then communicate this understanding to our K-12 colleagues?

WORKSHOP 2:
"Issues of Transfer and Articulation"
Mark Edelstein, leader

There are many changes and activities that are occurring within and between the California Community Colleges and the California State University that have implications not only for the transfer of credit between our institutions, but also have implications for what happens in the classroom. Recently, a state-wide policy for community colleges was approved by the Board of Governors which requires the community colleges to review and approve coursework applicable to the Associate Degree according to a set of standards and guidelines.

In addition, the Academic Senates of CSU and the community colleges have developed a draft statement on the definition of baccalaureate level coursework and the Intersegmental Academic Senates are developing a core of general education coursework and a lower division core of coursework for the biological sciences. Within the CSU, new transfer admission requirements have been developed which will have an impact on the course-taking pattern of community college students.

The purpose of this workshop is to discuss the implications of these new developments, review the process for the certification of community college coursework for transfer to CSU, and identify other areas of concern of the workshop participants. Strategies for improving dialogue between our faculties will be discussed.

WORKSHOP 3-A:
"Strategies for Placement and Assessment"
Allison Heisch, leader

Entrance and Exit Testing: By what means can CCC ensure the capability of their transfer students? Should CCC adopt a screening test comparable to the EPT Should all lower-division baccalaureate classes carry a common "certifying" exam (and, if so, of what should it consist?) What are the allowable differences (if any) between testing levels for native speakers and non-

native speakers? Should "developmental" ESL and native speakers be taught in separate classes? How should we identify/classify ESL students? Can we develop a cooperative model for intensive English skills development for ESL students? Is standardization of expectations compatible with present levels of part-time faculty? What should CCC do to assure that transfer students are prepared for the CSU Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement? Should CCC "certify" their transfer students? How?

WORKSHOP 3-B:
"Assessment in Mathematics"
Robert Stein, leader

Both the Community Colleges and the California State University have recognized the importance of assessment of the basic skills of incoming students and placement in classes for which the students are academically prepared. The CSU has instituted an entry level mathematics (ELM) examination which non-exempt students must pass in order to enroll in a General Education mathematics class. The Community Colleges have adopted a variety of instruments for local use and have begun system-wide policy development on mathematics assessment.

Because of the special relationship between the Community Colleges and the CSU in the transfer process, assessment procedures and expectations ideally would be coordinated between the two systems. How is this best accomplished? What are the limitations in coordinating assessment? Can any be overcome? What would be the best way to agree?

WORKSHOP 4:
Frieda Stahl and Shirley Trembley, leaders

The integration of English and mathematics skills involves both the linguistic and the logical aspects of the disciplines. In particular, the processes of problem solving require language skills even when the techniques are those of calculation. Furthermore, there are aesthetic dimensions in the study of mathematics that are humanistic in their conception. Thus the relationships between these disciplines might be explored with the purpose of benefiting learning in both.

Questions from the floor:

1. *What are the expected outcomes of the conference?*

(Frieda Stahl responding). The results need to be gathered in the form of citations of difficult problems to be explored further and mention of recommendations for development. There is funding of this CCC/CSU joint project for development of recommendations and we hope to reconvene at a later date and discuss our successes as well as our failures. We are looking for some specificity, and we hope to achieve it at this great beginning.

2. *You were earlier reviewing with some of us the state of the intersegmental committee that is dealing with curriculum. Could you share that information with everyone?*

(Frieda Stahl responding). Let me begin by saying again that the Academic Senates' Intersegmental Committee consists of the three Executive Committees of the three state-wide Academic Senates (CCC, CSU, UC). They set up a subcommittee for the ad hoc purpose of developing a transfer core curriculum as mandated in AB1725 and as urged in the Master Plan recommendations. We have dropped the word "core" from "core curriculum." In the mystique of the core there is an implication of uniformity; universities that have a "core curriculum" require every student to take the core, and they treat this as a unifying experience for their entire student bodies. It is eminently clear that we cannot have such common sharing among 106 community colleges, the 19 campuses of the CSU,

and the eight undergraduate campuses of the UC--plus the private institutions which sometimes get transfer students as well. What we do seek is a common basis for transferability, so we now call this the "transfer curriculum."

In addition there is great concern that lower division general education be completed in lower division standing. This is possible for many majors; it is impossible for many others. The General Education Advisory Committee of the California State University, in which Community College representatives participate, has recognized the problem of what is referred to as "high unit" majors. These are exemplified by such majors as engineering, agriculture, architecture, but the problem is not limited to those. The G.E. Advisory Committee has issued its set of recommendations which has filtered "upstairs"--so to speak--to the administration for adoption and implementation. Roughly, this set of guidelines first defines the high-unit major as one in which there is a sequential, serial relationship of prerequisites, one in which there is an indispensible body of support courses from other disciplines, so that one of the hallmarks of the high unit major is its multi-disciplinarity, which is true not only of engineering, but of physics, biochemistry, etc.

Then there is recognition given for the serial nature of study so that no student who embarks upon an increasing level of complexity is required to go back to square one and take introductory general education mathematics, for example, or physical science, because it is clearly a waste of the student's time and progress. We are trying desperately to get rid of the pejorative; we don't speak of waivers, or of double-counting--we are trying to defuse the issue and ask that the two populations of students be recognized for their intrinsic diversity.

We tried in the subcommittee to develop a secondary transfer curriculum for high unit majors. This is not yet ready to get off the ground. What we built the first proposal on--the tentative draft that we have circulated for response--was what Lee Kershner referred to last night as the brand new agreement among UC campuses to accept one another's lower division G.E., so that a student who starts at UC-Davis can transfer to Berkeley without losing credit and time. Their agreement had so much in common with the general education program adopted about five years ago by the CSU that we were able to build a correspondence in most, but not all, areas. In the original draft that I circulated in the subcommittee, I cited the problems for the CSU and the community colleges in our interdivisional agreements; there is no provision for speech, there is no provision for Section E (Personal Development), and there is no provision for the American institiutions requirement--so we came up short. In addition, there was a problem concerning foreign languages which is necessarily left in limbo. Whether we reserve units for additional exit requirements is further off in the future than the rest of the transfer curriculum.

The UC has a different set of operating conditions from that which is imposed upon the CSU. Their senate is the final arbiter of curriculum; ours is not: we have the Board of Trustees and the Legislature and Department of Finance and a whole bunch of superior bodies flogging us with whatever at the moment concerns them. In addition, the UC is free to accept high school work as a basis for waiving college work. This is true for American history and institutions, it is true for foreign language competency levels, and it is also true for basic skills. A student who takes high school calculus, for example, need not take any further college mathematics; this is not true in the CSU. So there are differences. The UC attitude toward speech is a shoulder shrug; their attitude toward critical thinking is that if writing is taught properly critical thinking is involved so a separate course is not necessary. Their attitude also is that they have no need to compromise; they believe that it would indeed take a great deal of debate and the outcome would not be assured at the level of their statewide senate.

So these problems beset the development of a transfer curriculum, and we are still struggling with it. The draft now circulating is incomplete, and the committee will be meeting again later in October.

The final problem with UC is that they have a conflicting obligation to which they are pledged. We are required to treat native and transfer students identically; that means that whatever we accept for transfer students we must also accept from our students. On the other hand, UC is committed to accepting as complete whatever lower division

program the student transfers, and requires no further lower division work. This means that if we say the high unit major has the privilege of distributing lower division courses for more than two years because that students must also take a body of calculus, a body of chemistry, or whatever, to feed into the ultimate major, UC cannot cope with an inadequate lower division program which they then must accept as complete. So they are rather adamant on developing transfer curricula for every single major, and the trial effort that is now going on in biology is addressed to that issue. What we call lower division major requirements, they simply dismiss as the "premajor." Their major is the upper division work in the final discipline.

So these are our sticky points for the charge that a community college student with sufficient academic prowess shall have a free choice among CSU or UC campuses at the end of the associate degree or its equivalent. It is not quite articulated between the two four year segments, and the community colleges are a great help in discussing it with us in committee, but I can't tell you the outcome.

3. *Our G.E. requirement at Sacramento State is considerably larger than the one being proposed for the transfer curriculum. Does this mean that we will have to lower our G.E. requirements in order to conform to the transfer curriculum? Or will we hold our native students to our campus G.E. requirement and accept a lower G.E. requirement of transfer students?*

(Frieda Stahl responding). We still have Title 5 of the Administrative Code which requires us to treat both populations identically. It is not the intention of the CSU representatives on the committee to cut G.E. off at 30 units. We need 39 units, and we know that some departments, particularly speech communication, are very concerned with this. There is talk of not being able to cope with Area E of General Education, but that is down the line. There are Area E guidelines coming forward to the Statewide Academic Senate, but we don't yet know the fate of those guidelines. There is much work yet to be done, and there is no definitive decision yet. The committee will wrestle with these problems at its meeting later this month.

3. *Since the intersegmental committee is still working on this, it may be premature for this group to spend too much time arguing about the specifics of the requirements in the transfer curriculum, and premature for this group to make recommendations as to what the general education curriculum should look like. However, as the workshops are discussing the issues and discussing the problems, I would urge all the workshops to make specific recommendations which would be directed to the Chancellors' Offices of the two systems, or to the Intersegmental Coordinating Council, or to the new cluster which will be working on articulation and coordination issues under the ICC. Could you inform people about what the structure of this new Intersegmental Coordinating Council will be like and how it is intended to operate.*

(Mark Edelstein responding). I've been chosen as the interim Executive Director of the Intersegmental Coordinating Council. Last November a group of faculty and administrative leaders from not only the three segments of higher education but the state department of education and the private colleges and universities in California met at Kellogg West to discuss articulation and coordination in the state and tried to develop a framework for voluntary coordination that might work better than the system that we have now (or the non-system that we have now). We took very seriously the report on the Articulation Council, both its strengths and weaknesses, that was done by CPEC and written by Bill Chance. We tried to develop a system of coordination that might be more effective than what we have been doing. The reason for this was quite obvious, aside from the various shortcoming which I think a lot of people had identified: there was the Master Planning Commission breathing down our necks, and I think it seemed to a lot of people that we had a choice between improving voluntary coordination or looking very seriously at the question of mandatory articulation and coordination among the various segments of higher education and secondary education in California. There is nothing like a gun at your head to focus your thoughts. This group has been working for the last year to try to develop some kind of system. The Intersegmental Coordinating Council will be made up of fourteen representatives from the five segments, including the Academic Senate

Presidents from the three segments of higher education, and top level administrators from all five segments. The Coordinating Council will be directly responsible to the California Education Round Table which is made up of the "principals"--the Chancellors of UC, CSU, CCC; Bill Honig; the chair of the private institutions; and the Executive Director of CPEC. The Round Table will be directly responsible to the state to ensure that there is a high level of equity, unity, efficiency, and quality in all five segments of education in California. The ICC will do this, not by running programs itself, but by coordinating cluster committees that in turn will coordinate the various intersegmental activities in the state. All of those intersegmental activities, all of the various projects that different groups around the state are involved in will be working under the umbrella of one of these cluster groups, and the cluster groups will be working under the umbrella of the Intersegmental Coordinating Council, and the ICC will be directly responsible to the Round Table. This structure sounds like something that Rube Goldberg might have thought up--it has struck some people like that--but the more you look at it, the more you see that it is designed to facilitate coordination and to ensure that there is not an enormous amount of bureaucratic overlay. The overlay is designed to facilitate rather than to hinder the real work of coordination and articulation which has to be done as close to the source as possible. Articulation is always going to occur when one faculty member from one institution talks to a faculty member from another institution. That is the kind of coordination and articulation that this whole system is designed to facilitate. We certainly hope that it will.

It would be perfectly appropriate, as you identify specific recommendations and resolutions, for you direct some of those to this newly formed ICC, or the various clusters that it will oversee.

5. *Comment by Connie Anderson:*

There is one additional outcome that we are hoping for as a result of this conference. Those of you who were asked to participate were asked because you are not only leaders in your disciplines, but also because you are located geographically around the state. We are hoping that from this conference there will be a nucleus of you in each region of the state who will be developing regional conferences similar to this so that we will be able to expand the number of people who are contributing to the dialogue that is beginning here.

WORKSHOP 1-A:

STANDARDS AND EXPECTATIONS IN ENGLISH

Workshop Leaders: Robert Noreen, CSU Northridge
Lloyd Thomas, LACC District Office

Recorders: Thomas Klammer (morning)
Robin Ching (afternoon)

Charge to the Participants:

The statewide academic senates of the CCC and CSU have approved a statement on the competencies in English expected of entering freshmen. Part of the statement on writing skills is as follows:

College and university faculty expect students to be able to understand, organize, synthesize, and communicate information, ideas, and opinions. Students must also be able to make critical judgments, to distinguish primary and relevant ideas from those that are subordinate or irrelevant. Students will be required in college courses to demonstrate these abilities by writing compositions, reports, term papers, and essay examinations. Because the learning process, as well as the quality of the student's written work, depends upon these abilities, it is crucial that these abilities be developed before students enter college.

As college and university teachers, should we assume that such preparation is taking place? Is this the starting point for our freshman English course, or our goal for its end? Should we, as college and university teachers, prepare a statement that would reflect achievements exceeding those suggested by the above statement? Are our resources adequate to realize our expectations?

Professor Noreen introduced the morning session by referring to the novel and perhaps promising features of the conference:

1) the conference was jointly called by the Chancellors of two of our systems of higher education;

2) the legislature is now considering a revised governance structure for the community colleges which may make the implementation of agreed upon standards in a course like freshman English much easier;

3) we are about to have a revised Master Plan for Higher Education in California; and

4) the bodies that coordinate higher education in California have been restructured.

Because of these circumstances, we now have a unique opportunity to express our concerns and recommendations at a very critical time in the relationships between the segments of higher education; furthermore, we now have the opportunity to address these concerns to several significant audiences which desire to hear from us and who are seeking our advice.

The discussion in both sessions ranged over a variety of topics:

1. The joint Academic Senates' statement on writing skills:

Most participants found that the statement on writing skills expected of entering freshman (part of which is quoted in our charge) characterizes our own goals for students exiting from our freshman writing courses. We would like our entering freshmen to possess these skills, but, in all honesty, we must admit that most of them do not. Some of the participants pointed out the difficulty of specifying a sequence of writing skills that would be acquired over a period of years with an accompanying curricula to support them. The development of writing skills is often incremental: we would expect a high school freshman to know how to construct a paragraph; a college freshman should be able to construct a more complex, more thoughtful paragraph. The statement is thus an equally good description of entry and exit level skills. On the college level, we would like to be able to assert that the students exiting from our freshman writing courses at both the CCC and CSU possess the skills that are described in the statement, and that in our freshman courses those skills have been strengthened through the analysis of more difficult reading, by requiring a higher level of thinking skills, and by placing a greater emphasis on the writing process and rhetoric than would occur at the high school level. Any freshman writing course that is not doing this should be re-examined.

Some participants objected to the vague generalizations of the entry writing skills statement. We need to translate the abstract statements into concrete terms that can be used by departments and individual teachers. Lloyd Thomas pointed out that an intersegmental committee, on which he sits and which has a good representation of English faculty, is now preparing a new statement of the writing skills expected of entering freshman. Professor Thomas distributed a draft of the statement which is much more specific than the Academic Senates' statement of 1982. He urged participants to review the statement and make suggestions to the committee.

2. Entry level placement and testing:

While assessment and placement were not to be a focus of this workshop, some discussion did take place about the relation of entry-level testing to the problems of expectations and standards. The CSU has the English Placement Test as the common placement standard, while many different means of placement are used on CCC campuses. CCC representatives pointed out the differences in admission procedures between the two systems and how these differences make assessment and placement a very difficult task. Then, too, the sheer size and number of different campuses make common testing difficult. Clearly, it would be ideal if all campuses in the CCC and the CSU used a common measure of proficiency for all students entering a bac-

calaureate freshman English course, but it is highly unlikely that such a common measure would be adopted. Nonetheless, CSU representatives urged that we explore possibility of using a single test, like the EPT, for all students entering college, and some discussion occurred about integrating placement testing into the senior year of high school.

Some participants encouraged the use of a common exit exam for freshman English throughout all systems to assure common standards. Obviously, a student's performance on such an exam would have a strong bearing on whether or not he or she passed the course.

3. Defining exit level skills through "model" freshman essays:

One suggestion that captured the interest of the morning workshop session was that we should redefine exit level skills through an inductive process rather than by merely listing standards and expectations which may or may not resemble the kind of writing that actually goes on in the course. This discussion resulted in an emerging plan for using "model papers," much like "range finders" in holistic gradings, to define the levels and kinds of abilities expected at the end of freshman composition (or at other levels--high school graduation, exit from remedial classes, etc.). Two plans of procedure were suggested:

I. Regional conferences

A. English faculty members at CCC and CSU campuses in a region would submit sets of graded student papers as "typical" of student work at different levels of achievement at the end of the freshman English course.

B. Full-time faculty representing the participating campuses would meet to select sets of the model papers which represent common standards of evaluation and to formulate descriptive statements that summarize their characteristics.

II. Statewide conference

A. Students in selected high school, CCC, CSU, and UC classes would write on a common topic in a controlled essay test.

B. Faculty from all segments would gather to score the essays holistically and to reach consensus on the features that characterize appropriate levels of achievement at each level.

C. Included in the statements of standards for student work would be principles regarding class size and the role and the status of part-time faculty.

In response to either of these approaches or to a combination of them, faculty members from all segments, especially the CCC and CSU, would define in concrete terms the standards and expectations for freshman composition and related levels of work. They would also be able to make specific recommendations in regard to the resources needed to provide the instruction necessary to enable all students to achieve the prescribed levels of writing ability.

4. "Critical Thinking" as a component of freshman English courses:

CSU participants were concerned that the critical thinking requirement has been too narrowly defined on many campuses, and the course or courses meeting this requirement are often politically controlled by one department. The general feeling of the group is that critical thinking should be discipline specific, and that, as is happening at many of the community colleges, critical thinking should be an expected and built-in component of all lower division courses.

5. Analytical readings in our freshman English courses should reflect the cultural diversity of our students:

Equity is a principle emphasis of the revised Master Plan. As English instructors, we support this emphasis and believe that it should be reflected in our curriculum. We feel that every effort should be made not only to serve minority

students adequately, but that we as faculty should do everything we can to ensure that readings and models of writing in all composition classes (English 1A and 1B, developmental courses, ESL courses) reflect the cultural and ethnic diversity of our students. Instructors in these classes should provide appropriate materials by a variety of representative writers beyond those few presently found in standard textbooks. English faculty in our two segments should share their discovery of such materials either through our English Councils or through regional and area conferences.

6. Appropriate sequencing of material in college writing courses:

It was suggested that some of the problems that students have in freshman composition arise because they are trying to do intellectual tasks that they are not prepared to do. As a writing faculty, we need to be more aware of how and when students develop higher level cognitive skills, and what the steps are leading to the development of these skills. The Master Plan encourages sequencing, and we need to study carefully the sequencing of our curriculum, as James Moffett suggested in his K-13 sequenced curriculum books.

7. Part-time writing instructors in the CSU and CCC:

The issue of part-timers emerged again and again in both workshop sessions. We are all familiar with the issues and what many consider the "abuse" of part-time faculty: there is an inequity between what is expected of them and what they can possibly do; some do not get paid for maintaining office hours although they are expected to do so, some have no offices, and they receive no additional compensation for committee or any other departmental work. Although part-timers in the CSU will now have a higher ceiling on their pay scale because of recent collective bargaining agreements, inequities still exist.

We are concerned with the issue of part-timers in this workshop because they staff such a large proportion of our writing courses. The nature of their working conditions often has a direct effect on the quality of standards and expectations we can maintain in our courses.

The CCC and CSU must seriously address anew the issue of part-timers in relation to the teaching of writing courses. We value the excellent contributions that most part-timers make to our programs. Most of them are serious, professional, and well-trained. Many are forced, however, to teach five or six courses in composition at different colleges for low salaries. These dedicated teachers are used, in effect, to balance the college budget. In efforts to maintain the quality of our programs, we should, of course, be concerned about the misuse of part-timers--the often late hiring of those who are not adequately prepared to teach writing courses, and those new part-timers who may go without adequate supervision--but we also must be concerned about the abuse of part-timers who are not provided with adequate office space, receive little compensation for additional work, and are assigned overly large classes. We are concerned that the misuse/abuse of part-timers may lessen the quality of our programs, despite whatever fine standards we might set for our courses.

If articulation is to become a reality, if a an academic experience of high quality is to be available to all, and if our students are truly to have access and a chance for success, then they deserve teachers who are adequately supported and appropriately supervised. We urge that fully qualified part-timers be allowed to apply for full-time non-tenure track lectureships, so that they may be admitted to full-time membership in English departments. We further urge that our systems adhere to the guidelines on part-time English staff which have been developed by the National Council of Teachers of English and the Modern Language Association.

8. Maintaining standards with divided staffs:

Participants from the state colleges noted the problems they often have in establishing and maintaining standards in writing courses among a faculty divided between part-time lecturers (who are susceptible to a variety of pressures to lower stand-

ards) and a full-time tenured faculty (many of whom have no interest in teaching writing and no desire to consult each other about such topics).

9. *Special concerns of Community College English faculty:*

Lois Powers, a workshop participant from Fullerton College, prepared a statement that expresses special concerns of the community college English instructors:

Each English department in 106 community colleges works under very different teaching conditions and in a very different political environment. Some are positive conditions; others are not. We need to consider not only how community college teaching conditions (load, class size, learning support services, level of students, proportion of part-time faculty, etc.) are different from state colleges but different among the 106 community colleges across the state. The same is true of the political environments in which we work. Many of us cannot make changes to improve standards or sustain quality. The "community" (usually ethnic pressure groups), student development and counseling (a large and influential entity on many campuses), the Academic Senate (sometimes unsympathetic), collective bargaining agents (usually concerned with other issues) and administrators (sometimes more concerned with ADA than instruction) work against the standards and quality that we want. Each campus battles a different political configuration, a different balance of power, and a different procedure for decision making. Many of us have a limited amount of decision making power and often cannot achieve what we want on our own campuses. There is no way to help each other, and our state English Council (ECCTYC) does not have the power to effect change on our individual campuses. Thus, many of us (not all) cannot alter the situations in which we find ourselves. Ironically, the matriculation plan mandated by the state--which should be helping us to strengthen assessment and placement--shifts more power to student development and counseling and, on some campuses, is working against us. Some English departments with successful placement programs are finding themselves challenged, and their programs being eroded rather than strengthened. Because no one college situation explains what is going on in the community college system, because community colleges have in some cases very limited freedom in determining the policies that govern their assessment, placement and course standards, and because, ultimately, each community college is involved in a unique political struggle. I think, perhaps, the only way to assure consistent English standards in the community college is to have directives that come from outside and above the campus level. We need mutually agreed upon statements, guidelines, and, perhaps, thoughtful directives from the three English Councils and/or the three Chancellors which support appropriate standards and, of course, specifically designated funding. That is to say, unless some power beyond our own individual political configurations supersedes and guides our diverse individual predicaments, many of us cannot do more than we are doing now. Recognizing that this strong position means a loss of local autonomy, but given the urgent need for improved conditions and a way to circumvent the political realities of individual campuses, I think the trade-off is necessary at this time. Thus, the solution needs to be found at a higher political level of decision making.

Recommendations:

Based on these discussions, the following recommendations emerged from Workshop I-A:

1. In order to assure common standards for the baccalaureate freshman English course in the CCC and CSU, we recommend that the community colleges adopt placement procedures similar to those in the CSU--either by using the English Placement Test or a test similar in scope.

2. Regional or statewide conferences should be set up to define the achievement levels expected at the end of the freshman English course. These

levels would be ascertained by the faculty according to the following procedures:

I. Regional conferences

A. English faculty members at CCC and CSU campuses in a region would submit sets of graded student papers as "typical" of student work at different levels of achievement at the end of the freshman English course.

B. Full-time faculty representing the participating campuses would meet to select sets of the model papers which represent common standards of evaluation and to formulate descriptive statements that summarize their characteristics.

II. Statewide conferences

A. Students in selected high school, CCC, CSU, and UC classes would write on a common topic in a controlled essay test.

B. Faculty from all segments would gather to score the essays holistically and to reach consensus on the features that characterize appropriate levels of achievement at each level.

C. Included in the statements of standards for student work would be principles regarding class size and the role and the status of part-time faculty.

3. English faculty in the CSU should strive to incorporate the Title V "critical thinking" requirement in their freshman English course perhaps as a second semester analytical writing course.

4. The subject matter and authors of the analytical readings in our freshman English courses should reflect the cultural diversity of our students.

5. Course committees for freshman English on campuses of the CSU and CCC should carefully examine the content of their courses to ensure that the material presented is appropriate for the cognitive abilities of their students.

6. Both the CSU and the CCC should very carefully address the issue of part-timers in relation to the teaching of writing courses. We are concerned that the conditions under which part-timers must work have an adverse effect on the standards we are trying to maintain in these courses.

7. CCC faculty urge that, as the state Chancellor's Office is given greater governing powers, attention be given to establishing common high standards for the baccalaureate freshman English course throughout the system. These standards will relate to course content, placement, class size, and staffing.

WORKSHOP 1B:

STANDARDS AND EXPECTATIONS IN MATHEMATICS

Workshop Leaders: Philip Emig, CSU, Northridge
Art Dull, Diablo Valley College

Recorders: Jean Vincenzi, Saddleback College (morning)
Art DeKleine, Cal Poly, SLO (afternoon)

Charge to the Workshop:

In three recent documents: The Model Curriculum Standards, adopted by the State Board of Education, 1985; Promises to Keep, adopted by C.P.E.C., 1983; and Competencies in English and Mathematics Expected of Entering Freshmen, adopted by the academic senates of the CCC and the CSU, 1982 (currently under revision) we find the following three statements:

"To accommodate changes in the way in which, and the extent to which, mathematics is used in our society, we must raise the expectations we have for our graduates."

"Among nine priorities it (CPEC) identified for action by the postsecondary community over the next five years were improvement of student preparation and improvement of student skills."

"The mathematics curriculum in high school and college consists of sequences of courses, each with specific topics to be learned to enable students to build upon their skills and understanding of mathematical operations."

As college teachers, should we assume that such preparation is taking place? Are standards and expectations what we want them to be? How do we foster analytical and critical thinking skills? What competencies are needed? Is there a knowledge base of lower division needed, standards required, critical thinking skills necessary for the entering freshman among ourselves and then communicate this understanding to our K-12 colleagues?

Phil Emig introduced the sessions by stressing that the two main thrusts of the conference are

---For participants to get to know other faculty in basic skills disciplines from both the CSU and CCC.

---To serve as the basis for initiating regional and area conferences on mathematics or English to which administrators, who might be in a position to implement the recommendations that are made here, may be invited.

Professor Emig then reviewed the recent history of mathematics education in the state and outlined the significant changes which have taken place:

1. The California State University now requires the Entry Level Mathematics test for all entering students. This test is waived for the top 30% of students because of prior demonstrated math proficiency. Fifty per cent of the remainder of entering students are able to pass the ELM test on their first try.

2. Three years of high school math rather than two years will be required for UC and CSU entrance as of 1988.

3. Intermediate algebra will no longer be a baccalaureate course in the CSU as of 1988.

Art Dull made the additional observations:

1. Math competencies for the A.A. degree in community colleges differ from math competencies necessary for the B.A. in the California State University.

2. Intermediate algebra is a pivotal course since it is a pre-requisite to so many other courses.

3. There is not enough trigonometry taught in high schools since it is usually combined with other subjects. Students thus come to college lacking sufficient preparation in trigonometry.

The major issues discussed by the workshop participants in both sessions are as follows:

1. Mathematics preparation in the high schools.

The patterns of math courses being taken by students and the number of teachers of mathematics in high schools is staying the same. While the participants wanted to spend most of their time in the workshop focussing upon CSU/CCC issues, they did recommend that a statement be issued jointly by the CSU/CC/UC on the math competencies expected of entering college freshmen. This statement would discuss the type of math testing the student could expect, the placement that would be based on this testing, and the content of math courses which students might have to take in college.

2. The Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) test.

The ELM test was discussed at length; participants questioned how it is used, how it is administered, by whom, at what cost, student acceptance, etc. (The ELM was also discussed at some length in Workshop 3-B).

Two recommendations regarding ELM were made by the members of this workshop:

A. Upgrade the ELM Test immediately to include competency in intermediate algebra.

B. Administer the ELM at the end of the intermediate algebra course and at the beginning of those courses which require intermediate algebra as a prerequisite.

(This would establish ELM as the floor for the transferring community college students, as well as for their counterparts in the CSU system.)

3. Diagnostic Testing.

The Math Diagnostic and Placement Test (MDTP) was discussed because of its potential for assessment and placement; as the workshop participants agreed, the maintaining of standards in mathematics courses is closely linked to proper assessment and placement of students.

(The MDTP was also discussed in Workshop 3-B. See p. 42.).

Many of the colleges represented in these sessions already use this battery of tests. It was agreed that these tests can predict failure very well, but are not very useful for predicting a student's success in a particular course. The test can help to maintain standards, though. For example, at Cal Poly--Pomona the pass rate in courses below the calculus level increased from 56% to 70% after the MDTP assessment test was made mandatory.

No formal recommendation was made by this workshop on diagnostic testing.

4. Mathematics course content

Participants expressed some concern that courses which go by the same name in community colleges and state university campuses might, in fact, have different content. The recommendation was made to arrange for local CSU/CC conferences where actual topics in the courses, called by the same name, could be compared and discussed.

5. Remedial math courses at the college level.

Where should remediation take place? Who should teach such remedial courses? Some successful cooperative programs were described which have utilized community college instructors on a CSU or UC campus. Other cooperative attempts have not been so successful. It was suggested that programs with such cooperative arrangements should be locally articulated. Questions of liability, ADA, and other problems need yet to be addressed.

6. Transferable community college math courses.

Questions were raised about what lower division mathematics courses could be developed by community colleges that might transfer easily to the CSU, and be counted for general education requirements. Suggestions included finite math, mathematics for elementary school teachers (problem solving), and Liberal Arts math.

7. Transferability of a "D" grade in mathematics.

Some participants were concerned that some campuses in the CSU accept a "D" grade in mathematics from a community college while other campuses do not. The CSU, it was felt, should develop a consistent policy with regard to accepting transfer courses.

8. Grandfather clause.

It should be noted that students can be "grandfathered" into the present prerequisites and competency requirements depending upon their date of entry into the CSU or CCC. Such a grandfather clause can affect students until 1992.

A number of other questions were raised which were discussed less thoroughly. Among them are:

1. Can the ELM be avoided more easily at some CSU campuses than at others?

2. Should we adopt a consistent stance regarding the use of calculators in our mathematics courses?

3. Is there any consistency among high schools in the state regarding the "third year" of high school mathematics? Is it always intermediate algebra?

4. Should statistics be a quantitative reasoning course? At what level? Should it be mathematically-based statistics? Should it be calculus-based statistics?

5. Do part-time mathematics instructors have a positive or a negative effect on the quality of teaching?

Recommendations:

The following recommendations emerged from the two sessions of Workshop I-B:

1. The CSU/CC/CCC should issue a revised joint statement be on the math competencies expected of entering college freshmen. This statement should discuss the type of math testing the student could expect, the placement that would be based on this testing, and the content of math courses which students might have to take in college.

2. The ELM test should be upgraded as quickly as possible (fall of 1988) to include the testing of competency in intermediate algebra. The ELM should then be administered to students at the end of their intermediate algebra course and at the beginning of those courses which require intermediate algebra as a prerequisite.

This policy would establish ELM as the floor for the transferring community college students, as well as for their counterparts in the CSU system.

3. Local CSU/CC mathematics conferences should be arranged where actual topics in lower division mathematics courses, which are called by the same name, could be compared and discussed. Course content of various quantitative reasoning courses which are used for general education requirements should also be compared.

4. The CSU should adopt a consistent policy with regard to the transferability of a "D" course in mathematics from a community college.

5. The community colleges should be given equal access to the MDTP exams on the same basis as those exams are made available to the UC, the CSU, and high schools.

6. The Chancellors' Offices of the CSU and the CCC should acknowledge the extent of the problem of mathematics remediation at the postsecondary level; an increased level of support for research in remedial education should be established.

WORKSHOP 2:

ISSUES OF TRANSFER AND ARTICULATION

Discussion Leader: Mark Edelstein, Palomar College

Recorders: Chris Burditt, Napa Valley College (morning)
David Horowitz, Golden West College (afternoon)

Charge to the Workshop:

There are many changes and activities that are occurring within and between the California Community Colleges and the California State University that have implications not only for the transfer of credit between our institutions, but also have implications for what happens in the classroom. Recently, a state-wide policy for community colleges was approved by the Board of Governors which requires the community colleges to review and approve coursework applicable to the Associate Degree according to a set of standards and guidelines.

In addition, the Academic Senates of CSU and the community colleges have developed a draft statement on the definition of baccalaureate level coursework and the Intersegmental Academic Senates are developing a core of general education coursework and a lower division core of coursework for the biological sciences. Within the CSU, new transfer admission requirements have been developed which will have an impact on the course-taking pattern of community college students.

The purpose of this workshop is to discuss the implications of these new developments, review the process for the certification of community college coursework for transfer to CSU, and identify other areas of concern of the workshop participants. Strategies for improving dialogue between our faculties will be discussed.

Both morning and afternoon workshops opened with a review of the issues related to transfer and articulation by Mark Edelstein, Stephanie Adams McGraw, and Connie Anderson. The topics covered included:

1) the Master Plan's emphasis on a unified articulation and transfer policy;

2) statistics pertaining to CCC students who transfer to CSU;

3) general definitions of baccalaureate level work;

4) projected Title 5 changes;

5) efforts currently being made to develop a lower division general education core curriculum; and

6) "curricular cohesion" between CCC and CSU, especially in the fundamental disciplines of English and mathematics.

To provide effective articulation, participants stressed again and again the need for faculty-to-faculty discussions between the CCC and the CSU. If the Master Plan is going to work efficiently, those of us in the CSU must treat CCC students who will transfer into our system by the same standards as we treat native CSU students. While continuing to pursue ease of transfer, and while continuing to promote equity in higher education, faculty in both systems must also give vigilant attention to maintaining the quality of our programs.

In the morning workshop, there was little agreement on the need for and the value of the California Articulation Numbering System (CANS), a system of common course descriptions throughout the segments. Several participants did argue that when these common course descriptions are developed, more attention should be paid to stating the competencies expected in specific courses, than just merely listing the content of such courses.

In the morning session, many supported the use of the Math Diagnostic and Placement Test (MDPT) and the Entry Level Mathematics Test (ELM) at California Community Colleges to enhance articulation and to assess agreed upon competencies. These tests are used widely in the CSU, and some community colleges already use the MDPT.

Mark Edelstein then asked for suggestions regarding the kinds of actions that should be undertaken by CCC and CSU faculties to better facilitate the transfer of students.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were made by the participants in Workshop 2:

1. A pilot project should be developed to test the viability of a common CCC/CSU exit examination from Freshman English Composition classes.

(This project should be tried at the local level in which three or four colleges would participate. A test, scoring guide and levels of proficiency should be developed locally and given to students who have completed English composition at each of the colleges. Subsequently, the respective English faculties from the colleges should meet to evaluate the results of this testing project and to find common areas of agreement based upon such results.)

2. Introductory courses in ordinary differential equations and linear algebra should be a part of the lower division curriculum at all CSU campuses. The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates should develop criteria to clarify the distinctions between upper and lower division coursework.

(At present all UC and some CSU campuses list these as upper division classes. This makes transfer and credit determination confusing for many CC science and engineering majors. Uniform listing of introductory ordinary differential equations and linear algebra courses

courses to take and what units would be applicable for the baccalaureate degree.)

3. Intersegmental faculty committees from CCC, CSU, and UC should write definitive course descriptions for each of the listings in the California Articulation Numbering System (CANS).

(Such course descriptions would provide a uniform basis for CANS and would help each college and university to determine those courses that can be effectively articulated within the system.)

4. English and Mathematics academic advising in both the CCC and CSU should involve faculty.

5. Since intermediate algebra is now a prerequisite for admission to the CSU, the California Community Colleges should also require intermediate algebra as a prerequisite for B.A. level general education courses on their campuses.

6. Community Colleges should consider using the ELM placement test for B.A. general education courses.

(While not appropriate for vocational students, the ELM test would lead to more appropriate placement of transfer students in baccalaureate or remedial courses. As has been true in the CSU, the test might enhance the quality of lower division mathematics courses offered at community colleges, and it would help ensure that math courses in the CCC and CSU are comparable.)

7. Sources for funding placement tests which are common to the CCC and the CSU (such as MDPT and possibly ELM) should be vigorously pursued.

8. The following specific recommendation resulted from a discussion among some of the participants following the workshop:

San Diego Community Colleges and San Diego State University will explore the possibility of making the EPT available to San Diego Community College students prior to their formal application for admission to San Diego State University.

(This recommendation is made because SDSU requires the EPT of CCC transfers even after successful completion of the freshman composition course at a community college, and because SDSU will not accept transfers until completion of lower division work. A student who completes freshman composition in his or her first semester at a community college is penalized by having to wait three semesters (until transfer) to take the EPT.)

WORKSHOP 3-A:

ASSESSMENT AND PLACEMENT IN ENGLISH

Workshop Leader: Allison Heisch, San Jose State University

Recorder: Edward Borowiec, CSU, Long Beach

Charge to the Workshop:

Entrance and Exit Testing: By what means can CCC ensure the capability of their transfer students? Should CCC adopt a screening test comparable to the EPT? Should all lower-division baccalaureate classes carry a common "certifying" exam (and, if so, of what should it consist?) What are the allowable differences (if any) between testing levels for native speakers and non-native speakers? Should "developmental" ESL and native speakers be taught in separate classes? How should we identify/classify ESL students? Can we develop a cooperative model for intensive English skills development for ESL students? Is standardization of expectations compatible with present levels of part-time faculty? What should CCC do to assure that transfer students are prepared for the CSU Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement? Should CCC "certify" their transfer students? How?

Allison Heisch began the session by emphasizing that the workshop would focus on issues that deal with the students we commonly share in the CSU and the CCC. Such a task is formidable in view of the large number of campuses involved--nineteen in the CSU and 106 in the CCC.

As we think of the issues of placement and assessment, we should be thinking in terms of the areas or regions which we serve; in future cooperative efforts, the 19 CSU campuses be appropriate focal points for the area community colleges which feed into them.

In considering assessment and placement, we need also to focus on the growing ESL population which may range up to 44% at some CSU campuses. Forty percent of ESL students score below the level which would provide direct entry into freshman English courses.

The following topics were discussed in the two workshop sessions:

1. Placement of entry students in writing courses

While the CSU has systematized placement with its English Placement Test, placement of entry students in the 106-campus CCC varies from campus to campus. The question remains: are students entering a freshman composition course on a community college campus with equivalent proficiency as a student at a CSU campus? Are those who pass such courses at comparable levels of proficiency?

In an ideal world, a common EPT in the CSU and the CCC might help establish equivalent standards. But, even in the CSU, a common placement test for entry level writing students does not solve all of the placement problems. A significant problem for many CSU campuses is how to deal adequately with the developmental student whose score is below T-151 on the EPT. The lower half of this population is particularly critical in view of placement and assessment. Better ways need to be devised for dealing with two obvious groups in the EPT at the bottom quartile: those students scoring T-135 to T-141, and those students scoring T-134 and below. A recent study at CSU-LA has shown that the ESL students who are doing poorly on the EPT also have phonological and syntactic difficulties in their own language; the problem is thus not solely the difficulty of such students to learn fluency in English, but has to do with their basic incompetency in any language skills.

2. Placement of ESL students in entry level writing courses

It became clear from the discussion that our means of identifying and placing non-native students varies from campus to campus. For the developmental courses on some CSU campuses, ESL students are self-selected into special ESL sections, and little attempt is made to switch students into an ESL section from a native student section even if it is obvious that they could profit from such an experience. Each CCC campus develops its own program or procedure. How do we reconcile this problem with the notion of simultaneous enrollment, of equivalent quality, etc.?

3. Developmental Programs

The issue of remediation concerned the group. Is remediation a prime responsibility of the CCC's or is it and will it continue to be a shared responsibility? What is the CSU role regarding those who do not possess required literacy skills? "Language certification" has become a heavy political issue at CCC campuses; CCC participants objected to certification testing only for those students of theirs entering the CSU. The program excludes CSU native students.

4. Class Size

In order to maintain equivalent quality of programs in the two systems, it is important to address the issue of class size. With the ILE program, the CSU can maintain a 12:1 student faculty ratio, but comparable classes at the CCC often exceed 30:1. This issue should generate a CSU/CCC recommendation on class size for both regular composition classes and develop-

mental classes. It is recommended that the guidelines of the Association of Departments of English be followed with regard to class size:

24:1 student faculty ratio for regular composition classes.

15:1 student faculty ratio for developmental classes.

5. Requirement of a two-semester composition class

The groups discussed whether the systems should require one year of freshman composition, instead of only one semester (or three quarters instead of two). Some participants made the point that some universities are already requiring one year of composition, and others are considering increasing the course unit requirement from 3 to 4. Other participants suggested that if a two semester sequence were required, some kind of challenge exam for the first sequence course should be made available.

6. Critical Thinking Requirement

Some schools are concerned that one department (often philosophy) provides the only courses to meet the Title V mandated critical thinking requirement. Critical thinking has always been a part of studies in rhetoric and literature, and English Departments should be encouraged to promote appropriate courses in their curricula to meet this requirement. Some suggested that a second semester freshman composition course might be an appropriate "critical thinking" course.

7. Intermediate Writing Test

The use of an intermediate writing test for transfer students to prepare then for CSU upper division writing requirements was suggested. CSU-Chico's WEST TEST provides such a model.

8. Graduate Writing Proficiency Requirement (GWAR or WPE)

Some participants were concerned about whether our courses are giving students adequate preparation to pass the graduate writing requirement. The GWAR/WPE does provide us with a vital tool for assessing where we are in our writing proficiency programs, from the junior level downward. The GWAR/WPE provides a constant reminder that faculty in all disciplines need to demand more writing in their classes. All campuses are concerned with the inability of some students to meet this requirement in a timely manner; on some campuses, the performance of CCC transfer students is of concern, and on almost all campuses the lower pass rate of ESL students is of great concern. The CSU needs to make CCC faculty more aware of the specific GWAR/WPE requirements on CSU campuses. The CSU might provide CCC faculty opportunities to become involved in the development, evaluation, and scoring of the GWAR/WPE test.

9. Common Curriculum Standards for Writing Courses

The question was raised whether CSU/CCC faculty in English should examine and compare composition curricula to suggest areas of improvement or to maintain similar standards for equivalent courses. We need to identify our common expectations and standards for students.

10. Tracking or Tracing Students

We need to develop recommendations regarding assessing, placing , and tracking students who transfer from CCC to CSU.

11. ESL Issues

Some participants felt that ESL students have too many options available which enables them to escape the rigors of a regular composition class. They often take summer or evening programs that are sustained by budgets generated by student fees (which might be subject to lower academic standards), or they operate under different academic standards. Often, maintaining ESL sections for regular freshman composition works against the best interests of the ESL student. One study shows that ESL students who

were mainstreamed in their freshman year had a higher pass rate on local ESL tests and on the CSU Graduate Writing Proficiency Exam. It was therefore recommended by the morning session that ESL students be mainstreamed as soon as possible or when practicable. Members of the afternoon session recommended the use of instructional improvement funds within the CCC and CSU for immersion/saturation language development programs.

12. Credit for ESL classes

Several organizations (CATESOL and others) have recently recommended granting B.A. credit--either full or partial--to ESL students for courses that provide remediation or basic work in ESL. Some community colleges are feeling pressure on this point. Most of the group was strongly opposed to the granting of such credit except in those courses which are now designated as B.A. courses, but may have ESL sections. It was noted that the CSU Trustees have adopted the position that English is the state's primary language and have refused to examine the issue of granting credit for ESL classes.

13. Funding and Resources

In our discussions about maintaining a quality program in composition, CCC faculty were particularly concerned that inadequate funding for their programs seriously affects the quality of such programs. Funding is inadequate for testing or certification, and thus standards are consequently lowered.

Recommendations

The recommendations that emerged from these sessions are as follows:

1. In order to maintain equivalent quality of writing programs in the CCC and CSU, a similar limit on class size for both regular composition classes and developmental classes should be adopted. It is recommended that the guidelines of the Association of Departments of English be followed with regard to class size:

24:1 student faculty ratio for regular composition classes
15:1 student faculty ratio for developmental classes

2. The community colleges and the CSU should adopt a consistent policy of requiring one year of freshman composition. The second semester composition course would be an appropriate "critical thinking" course, since critical thinking has always been a part of studies in rhetoric and literature.

3. The faculties are concerned whether lower division writing courses are giving students adequate preparation to pass the graduate writing requirement. The CSU should make CCC faculty more aware of the specific graduate writing proficiency requirements, and should provide CCC faculty opportunities to become involved in the development, evaluation, and scoring of such proficiency tests.

4. The CSU and CCC should adopt consistent policies for placing ESL students into developmental writing courses.

5. Since maintaining separate ESL sections for freshman writing courses often works against the best interests of the ESL student, it is recommended that ESL students be mainstreamed in all courses that confer baccalaureate credit.

6. Each state university and its feeder community colleges should establish an area or regional advisory board in English that would meet periodically to discuss issues of testing, scoring, evaluation of transcripts, and comparative curricula.

7. The participants in this workshop recommend that the CSU and the CCC provide funds for regional follow-up conferences to continue specific discussions of the recommendations that have emerged from this conference.

WORKSHOP 3-B:

ASSESSMENT AND PLACEMENT IN MATHEMATICS

Workshop Leader: Robert Stein, CSU, San Bernardino

Recorders: Lois Yamakoshi, Los Medanos College (morning)
Merle Friel, Humboldt State University (afternoon)

Charge to the Workshop:

Both the Community Colleges and the California State University have recognized the importance of assessment of the basic skills of incoming students and placement in classes for which the students are academically prepared. The CSU has instituted an entry level mathematics (ELM) examination which non-exempt students must pass in order to enroll in a General Education mathematics class. The Community Colleges have adopted a variety of instruments for local use and have begun system-wide policy development on mathematics assessment.

Because of the special relationship between the Community Colleges and the CSU in the transfer process, assessment procedures and expectations ideally would be coordinated between the two systems. How is this best accomplished? What are the limitations in coordinating assessment? Can any be overcome? What would be the best way to agree?

Robert Stein began the workshop sessions by raising several questions related to assessment and placement in mathematics:

1) What, with regard to assessment and placement in math, is being now done on CCC and CSU campuses?

2) What is the Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) test? Which other placement tests are in circulation?

3) Is evaluation little more than a hodgepodge of various methods and tests?

4) What are the problems we share in common? How should we proceed in solving these problems?

The Entry Level Mathematics test (ELM) was first defined and discussed, particularly for the benefit of those community college faculty who are not familiar with it. The ELM is the placement test developed by CSU faculty for placement of students in college level mathematics courses. By passing the test, students demonstrate that they are competent in mathematics at the college entry level. The test includes some arithmetic, elementary algebra, and geometric measurement skills. It does not include statistics or intermediate algebra. The test is administered by the Educational Testing Service, usually in conjunction with the English Placement Test. Currently, students are exempted from the test with a 530 Math SAT score, 23 ACT, or an AP Calculus score of 3 or above. About 30% of entering students are now exempted from taking the test on these bases. The failure rate for minority students remains high. A CSU student must pass the ELM within one year of entrance in order to remain at the university.

Some CSU faculty are concerned about what they see as a misuse of the test on some campuses. Specifically, the ELM test allows students to demonstrate that they are competent in mathematics at the college entry level; it is not intended as a placement test, and any use of it in that regard must be done with great caution.

Several issues related to ELM were discussed:

1. Placement and Exemption Procedures: One problem of continuing concern involves a lack of consistency in requirements for students who take the ELM: native CSU students have different requirements to meet following the ELM assessment than CCC transfer students. Also, confusion has been created by the lack of uniform policy throughout the CSU on whether or not Intermediate Algebra courses are to be counted for general studies credit. In effect, a campus which accepts such courses from transfer students exempts those students from the ELM requirement, while holding their own students to it. Fortunately, such inconsistencies will be ended in fall, 1988, when Intermediate Algebra will no longer be accepted for credit at any CSU campus.

2. Expanding the ELM test: With the deletion of intermediate algebra as a baccalaureate course, the ELM Test Design Committee would like to add some intermediate algebra questions to the test; they have not yet been allowed to do so, other than to include a few such questions that are not considered in determining the final score.

3. ELM Placement for all B.A. students: Many participants felt that the ELM should be an entry requirement for both the CSU and the CCC. If the Master Plan stresses that B.A. students in the CSU and transfer students from the CCC should be treated equitably, then all students intending to pursue a B.A., whether they are in the CSU or CCC students who will later transfer, should take the ELM test and be placed in mathematics courses according to their abilities. If the ELM exam were to be administered to prospective or current CCC students, then the test design committee should also have CCC representatives. Also, CCC students taking the ELM test should not have to pay a fee.

Various other placement exams used on CCC and CSU campuses were also discussed by

workshop participants. Each member of both morning and afternoon sessions described the placement practices at his or her campus. The most common placement exam used is the Math Diagnostic and Placement Test (MDPT) developed by a joint committee of UC and CSU faculty. Several participants stressed that placement tests helps to maintain standards; they are not predictors of success in a course, but of potential failure. Most participants seemed satisfied with this kind of prediction. Success very often depends on the motivation of the student and the quality of teaching in the course.

The security of common exams was discussed by both groups. Several members pointed out that the MDPT is available in several versions; the fact that a separate version is used for high schools helps maintain security.

Some of the math placement procedures described by participants are as follows:

Merced CC: A standardized test, given on demand, is being used for the first time this year. It has provided good placement for algebra courses; no placement test is used for calculus courses. We are pleased with the test, but, if anything, it places students too low.

Skyline College: The MDPT is used for all levels of math. Two of four parts of matriculation are done. Students are assessed and placed; but with no counseling, computer lock-out, or minimal follow-up, much is left up to the instructor to verify appropriate placement. The test seems to predict failure rather than success. The test is given several times before registration and during the first few days of each semester; students are allowed to re-test.

Santa Barbara CC: The MDPT, used for 5-6 years works well with mandatory placement due to computer lock-out.

It is administered by a campus testing officer upon student request.

Los Angeles CC: The Counseling Office administers both the MDPT (for prospective calculus students) and ASSET (for arithmetic and beginning algebra skills).

Cal Poly, Pomona: The MDPT is used with the pre-calculus test, intermediate algebra (for GE course placement) and the Basic Algebra test (for the remedial program), but all three levels of tests have cut-off scores for all math classes, so a student takes only one exam, of his or her choice. The test is administered 3-4 times per quarter--at pre-registration, during first week of classes, and at the end of the quarter. Test results are valid for only two quarters, and then a student must retest. If a student earns a "C" or better in our intermediate algebra (remedial) course then he or she is exempt from the two quarter testing limit.The final exam for intermediate algebra is a good predictor for the next math class. A "C" in a pre-calculus class does not enable enrollment into a calculus class, however; for this the student must take the MDPT. If a student should get a "B" in pre-calculus and fail the MDPT, he or she is provided with an individual study program and retested after a few weeks. Cut-off scores are mandatory. The cut-off score is two points lower than the MDPT suggested mastery level, which provides us with justification for keeping firm if the student missed the cut-off score by only 1-2 points. We have benefited from a strong placement program: our math FTE has increased, "C" or better grades in G.E. courses have increased from 50% to 70%, and our business school has reinstated their math class as more students are prepared for the course.

CSU, Los Angeles: In-house developed tests are used for all levels of math and the results are mandatory, although a computer lock-out system is not used. There are four versions of each level. The tests are failure predictor tests, and sometimes a student must take more than one test to determine placement.

San Francisco State: No placement tests are given, but an advisement letter is sent to prospective students.

Palomar College: Students can enroll in calculus without the prerequisite, but during the first week of school, the records office checks for pre-requisites, and if missing, the student is administratively dropped. We now have in-house tests (four or five versions of each) for beginning and intermediate algebra placement.

CSU, Sacramento: The MDTP is used at all levels up to calculus and is required of students. It is administered before the semester begins and during the first week of school. The test must be taken before each math course. Students will be administratively dropped if the test is not passed.

CSU, Northridge: The MDTP is used for all math courses except Liberal Studies/teacher preparation courses and statistics. Computer registration locks-out unqualified students. Late registrants are checked by the math department.

Cerritos College: Placement tests are given to all students with mandatory placement.

Humboldt State: Students are tested once by in-house exam. No further testing is necessary if the student stays at the university. Computer registration locks-out unqualified students.

Cal State, San Bernardino: Placement tests are new, and are advisory only. The MDTP is used for intermediate algebra, and a modified version for elementary functions.

Cal State, Dominguez Hills: It has been difficult to offer placement tests prior to registration. Some instructors give diagnostic tests the first day of class which are advisory only.

The participants realized that the variety of placement procedures used within the CCC and the CSU is so great that achieving consistency would be impossible, if even desireable. Sharing information is important, though, and ways to do this were discussed. A CSU campus could host a meeting with area community colleges and high schools to discuss math requirements and placement procedures. CSU-Sacramento already hosts such a meeting every spring semester.

Recommendations

Following these discussions, the workshop participants in either the morning or afternoon sessions agreed upon these recommendations:

1. The ELM test should be required for entrance to all courses which carry General Education credit in the CSU and the CCC.

2. The ELM test questions should be upgraded to reflect the increased high school preparation in mathematics now required for CSU admission.

3. In view of the cooperative efforts of the CSU and CCC, steps should be taken by the appropriate administrators to provide adequate and reasonable ELM testing dates to accommodate both systems, and that funding be provided so that the ELM test can be offered at a reasonable cost to students.

4. Because of the diversity from campus to campus, no coordination for other placement tests is necessary. each campus should continue to develop its own math placement testing for individual courses as appropriate. We need, however, to share information about the nature and success of specific placement procedures with each other through regional meetings or possibly by means of an electronic bulletin board. The CSU/CCC campuses should consider agreeing on cut-off scores when the same test is used.

5. Regional conferences should be held for math faculties of the CSU and CCC to discuss placement exams, the ELM, and new math entrance requirements. These conferences should begin in the spring of 1988, with CSU campuses serving as hosts for their region. Conference proceedings should be sent to area articulation officers and college presidents. Initial funding for such conferences could come from the present project.

WORKSHOP 4:

INTEGRATION OF ENGLISH AND MATH

Workshop Leaders: Frieda Stahl, CSU, Los Angeles
Shirley Trembley, Bakersfield College

Recorders: Mona Rosenman, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo (morning)
Lynda Myers, Mendocino College (afternoon)

Charge to the Workshop:

The integration of English and mathematics skills involves both the linguistic and the logical aspects of the disciplines. In particular, the processes of problem solving require language skills even when the techniques are those of calculation. Furthermore, there are aesthetic dimensions in the study of mathematics that are humanistic in their conception. Thus the relationships between these disciplines might be explored with the purpose of benefiting learning in both.

In the morning session the discussion focused upon possible cooperation between the disciplines of mathematics and English, and did not address in any depth the relationships between the CCC and the CSU. Some of the suggestions made by participants might be considered by individual campuses in both segments; others might offer opportunities for intersegmental cooperation.

Participants in these workshops discussed the following issues:

1. The failure of students to integrate problem solving skills

As instructors of math and English, we need to have a shared frame of reference by which to talk about the underlying cognitive processes common to both disciplines. Our math and English students often fail to perceive that language and math require similar analytical skills, and they should be taught this. Problem solving, which requires careful analysis, is common to both mathematics and critical reading. Often, math students think that formulas are the gospel; they need to be trained, as are English students, that solutions often depend upon one's ability to understand the context, as in solving rhetorical problems in writing. But English students, too, often have difficulty following through on a chain of reasoning, the kind of reasoning many math problems present. Students, whether math or English, have difficulty analyzing problems, and they often do not even understand the task that is set before them. Teachers may just present information, with their students taking it in; no analysis is expected or necessary. Students expect to learn material by chapter and have trouble with carry over. Answers are valued, not the reasoning process or the analytical thinking. This leads to shallow, superficial thinking in English, and an obsession with correct answers in math.

Students may understand how to solve problems when they are led step-by-step through a task, but they then may be unable to reproduce the sequence of steps on their own. Math students may need to have word problems broken down into parts, and then be led through the parts. After this, the students might be given a number of facts, and be asked to construct a word problem out of these facts. They need further practice in using evidence to support conclusions, as they might do in working out a geometry problem.

2. Non-differential reading

Students do not know how to read differently for different purposes. They have not had sufficient training in paraphrasing, a training which would help them in both English and mathematics. Unfortunately, reading is the least emphasized part of the freshman English course, and many students leave the course still not able to comprehend more difficult readings.

3. Differential remediation

Some students may need remediation in one basic skill while they are advanced in another (e.g., the ESL student taking basic English and advanced calculus, or the humanities major taking the study of fiction and intermediate algebra). Or a student may be enrolled in a history course requiring writing, even though he or she has not completed a remedial writing course. Insofar as basic skills may be interdependent, students should remove all deficiencies in basic skills before being allowed to take other sources requiring those skills.

4. The verbal structure of math solutions

The verbal structure of math solutions is not being taught very well. Students do not know how to derive information from logical interconnections. The information given in math exams is often exactly what the student needs. Hence, no analysis is required, just computation. It might be better to give too much information, and then the student must consider what should be used, or too little information, and then the student must ask what is missing. Students should also be trained to describe in writing the methods by which they reach conclusions or solve problems.

5. Perceiving relationships

Students often do not transfer learning, particularly in mathematics courses, even when courses are sequential. Information is taught in categories so that students do not see relationships, as, for example, between algebra and geometry. More efforts need to be made to integrate learning and to show relationships.

6. Integrating math and English skills in the classroom

As instructors, do we understand how math can be used in English courses or English in math courses? Math teachers can, of course, ask their students to write out problems that they propose (e.g., Explain how you would compute the gas mileage for your car.). English instructors need to use visual material for teaching reading and writing, including the use of diagrams, charts, flow charts, matrices, tree diagrams, etc.

Several suggestions were made during the workshops for joint projects between English and mathematic instructors:

1. English and math instructors could develop and team-teach a special course in which the interaction between and relevance of one subject to the other are stressed and demonstrated.

2. Basic composition courses utilizing materials developed jointly by English instructors--but geared toward math--should be offered. Explore ways that math and English instructors can cooperate, for example, by creating assignments for each other, using a team model.

3. Faculty should work cooperatively to redesign existing courses to facilitate math and English collaboration and critical thinking skills. In such courses stress inductive, as well as deductive, reasoning

4. Provide training for teachers in how to teach reading in mathematics classes. Students don't succeed in mathematics because they don't read the word problems. They don't think logically. Students can read the words on the page, but they do not think when they read.

5. A small group of mathematics and English instructors should jointly develop a short module on "English Skills which are Applicable in Mathematics Courses."

David Horowitz, Golden West College, offered the following suggestions for topics that might be considered in such a module:

a) Reading Skills: Show how to analyze a non-trivial math problem; what quantity is being sought, what data is being provided?

b) Critical Thinking Skills: Show how to "model" a problem in mathematical terms; what mathematical methods should be applied to the model? Show how to analyze the "correctness" or "appropriateness" of the results obtained.

c) Writing Skills: Express clearly and explicitly the solution of a mathematical problem using appropriate English; what "units" are involved in the answer?

Such a module could become a small portion of appropriate English classes at many college. If such a module is developed, it should be distributed throughout the CSU and CCC for possible use in writing courses. With such instruction, mathematics students might be better prepared to solve applications-oriented problems by using certain fundamental English skills.

Recommendations

The recommendations that emerged from these sessions are:

1. Composition teachers should use materials that demand the development of analytical skills. Reading material should stress ideas, the "cognitive" domain rather than the "affective" domain which might be stressed in imaginative literature.

Students should be required to write expository essays which require analysis, reasoning, and argument rather, than those essays which focus on narration and description alone.

2. Math instructors in both our systems should be encouraged to utilize more essay-type examinations (which require the student to explain a chain of reasoning), rather than relying only upon multiple-choice or single answer tests.

3. All composition classes, remedial and ESL in particular, should be small enough on both CCC and CSU campuses to allow for individualized instruction.

4. Until such time when four years of high school mathematics is made mandatory, college-bound students should be strongly urged to take four years of mathematics in high school.

5. Since success in basic G.E. math and English courses is fundamental to success in college, students should meet such general education requirements during their freshman year--before they take other courses requiring such skills.

6. Students who found to be deficient in reading, writing, or math skills, should complete remedial courses before they take other courses requiring such skills. In other words, remediation should precede college level work.

CONFERENCE RECOMMENDATIONS

Conference on English and Mathematics
Napa, California, October 21-23, 1987

Sponsored by the Chancellors' Offices of the
California State University and California Community Colleges

The following are recommendations made by the participants at the Napa Conference on English and Mathematics, October 21-23, 1987. It should be noted that not all participants supported every recommendation. No votes were taken, nor were formal resolutions made. These are the suggestions which emerged from the workshops and they reflect the various concerns of CCC and CSU faculties in English and mathematics. The Conference Planning Committee reviewed the recommendations, and has included those here which it feels should be implemented or should be discussed further by other concerned groups. Please see the proceedings of the workshops for a more detailed discussion of these recommendations.

Standards and Expectations in English

1. In order to assure common standards for the baccalaureate freshman English course in the CCC and CSU, we recommend that the community colleges adopt placement procedures similar to those in the CSU--either by using the English Placement Test or a test similar in scope.

2. Regional or statewide conferences should be set up to define the achievement levels expected at the end of the freshman English course. These levels would be ascertained by the faculty according to the following procedures:

I. Regional conferences

A. English faculty members at CCC and CSU campuses in a region would submit sets of graded student papers as "typical" of student work at different levels of achievement at the end of the freshman English course.

B. Full-time faculty representing the participating campuses would meet to select sets of the model papers which represent common standards of evaluation and to formulate descriptive statements that summarize their characteristics.

II. Statewide conference

A. Students in selected high school, CCC, CSU, and UC classes would write on a common topic in a controlled essay test.

B. Faculty from all segments would gather to score the essays holistically and to reach consensus on the features that characterize appropriate levels of achievement at each level.

C. Included in the statements of standards for student work would be principles regarding class size and the role and the status of part-time faculty.

3. English faculty in the CSU should strive to incorporate the Title 5 "critical thinking" requirement in their freshman English course perhaps as a second semester analytical writing course.

4. The subject matter and authors of the analytical readings in our freshman English courses should reflect the cultural diversity of our students.

5. Course committees for freshman English on campuses of the CSU and CCC should carefully examine the content of their courses to ensure that the material presented is appropriate for the cognitive abilities of their students.

6. Both the CSU and the CCC should very carefully address the issue of part-timers in relation to the teaching of writing courses. We are concerned that the conditions under which part-timers must work have an adverse effect on the standards we are trying to maintain in these courses.

7. CCC faculty urge that, as the state Chancellor's Office is given greater governing powers, attention be given to establishing common high standards for the baccalaureate freshman English course throughout the system. These standards will relate to course content, placement, class size, and staffing.

Standards and Expectations in Mathematics

8. The CSU/CC/CCC should issue a revised joint statement be on the math competencies expected of entering college freshmen. This statement should discuss the type of math testing the student could expect, the placement that would be based on this testing, and the content of math courses which students might have to take in college.

9. The ELM test should be upgraded as quickly as possible (fall of 1988) to include the testing of competency in intermediate algebra. The ELM should then be administered to students at the end of their intermediate algebra course and at

the beginning of those courses which require intermediate algebra as a prerequisite.

This policy would establish ELM as the floor for the transferring community college students, as well as for their counterparts in the CSU system.

10. Local CSU/CC mathematics conferences should be arranged where actual topics in lower division mathematics courses, which are called by the same name, could be compared and discussed. Course content of various quantitative reasoning courses which are used for general education requirements should also be compared.

11. The CSU should adopt a consistent policy with regard to the transferability of a "D" course in mathematics from a community college.

12. The community colleges should be given equal access to the MDTP exams on the same basis as those exams are made available to the UC, the CSU, and high schools.

13. The Chancellors' Offices of the CSU and the CCC should acknowledge the extent of the problem of mathematics remediation at the postsecondary level; an increased level of support for research in remedial education should be established.

Issues of Transfer and Articulation

14. A pilot project should be developed to test the viability of a common CCC/CSU exit examination from Freshman English Composition classes.

This project should be tried at the local level in which three or four colleges would participate. A test, scoring guide and levels of proficiency should be developed locally and given to students who have completed English composition at each of the colleges. Subsequently, the respective English faculties from the colleges should meet to evaluate the results of this testing project and to find common areas of agreement based upon such results.

15. Introductory courses in ordinary differential equations and linear algebra should be a part of the lower division curriculum at all CSU campuses. The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates should develop criteria to clarify the distinctions between upper and lower division coursework.

At present all UC and some CSU campuses list these as upper division classes. This makes transfer and credit determination confusing for many CC science and engineering majors. Uniform listing of introductory ordinary differential equations and linear algebra courses throughout the CSU system would once and for all clearly distinguish lower and upper division mathematics courses throughout California postsecondary institutions. In this respect it would be beneficial to develop a complete and uniform delineation of all lower and upper division coursework for all disciplines. This would greatly assist transfer students in determining what courses to take and what units would be applicable for the baccalaureate degree.

16. Intersegmental faculty committees from CCC, CSU, and UC should write definitive course descriptions for each of the listings in the California Articulation Numbering System (CANS).

Such course descriptions would provide a uniform basis for CANS and would help each college and university to determine those courses that can be effectively articulated within the system.

17. English and Mathematics academic advising in both the CCC and CSU should involve faculty.

18. Since intermediate algebra is now a prerequisite for admission to the CSU the California Community Colleges should also require intermediate algebra as a prerequisite for B.A. level general education courses on their campuses.

19. Community Colleges should consider using the ELM placement test for B.A. general education courses.

While not appropriate for vocational students, the ELM test would lead to more appropriate placement of transfer students in baccalaureate or remedial courses. As has been true in the CSU, the test might enhance the quality of lower division mathematics courses offered at community colleges, and it would help ensure that math courses in the CCC and CSU are comparable.

20. Sources for funding placement tests which are common to the CCC and the CSU (such as MDPT and possibly ELM) should be vigorously pursued.

The following specific recommendation resulted from a discussion among some of the participants following the workshop:

21. San Diego Community Colleges and San Diego State University will explore the possibility of making the EPT available to San Diego Community College students prior to their formal application for admission to San Diego State University.

Assessment and Placement in English

22. In order to maintain equivalent quality of writing programs in the CCC and CSU, a similar limit on class size for both regular composition classes and developmental classes should be adopted. It is recommended that the guidelines of the Association of Departments of English be followed with regard to class size:

24:1 student faculty ratio for regular composition classes
15:1 student faculty ratio for developmental classes

23. The community colleges and the CSU should adopt a consistent policy of requiring one year of freshman composition. The second semester composition course would be an appropriate "critical thinking" course, since critical thinking has always been a part of studies in rhetoric and literature.

24. The faculties are concerned whether lower division writing courses are giving students adequate preparation to pass the graduate writing requirement. The CSU should make CCC faculty more aware of the specific graduate writing proficiency requirements, and should provide CCC faculty opportunities to become involved in the development, evaluation, and scoring of such proficiency tests.

25. The CSU and CCC should adopt consistent policies for placing ESL students into developmental writing courses.

26. Since maintaining separate ESL sections for freshman writing courses often works against the best interests of the ESL student, it is recommended that ESL students be mainstreamed in all courses that confer baccalaureate credit.

27. Each state university and its feeder community colleges should establish an area or regional advisory board in English that would meet periodically to discuss issues of testing, scoring, evaluation of transcripts, and comparative curricula.

28. The participants in this workshop recommend that the CSU and the CCC provide funds for regional follow-up conferences to continue specific discussions of the recommendations that have emerged from this conference.

Assessment and Placement in Mathematics

29. The Entry Level Mathematics test (ELM) should be required for entrance to all courses which carry General Education credit in the California State University and the California Community Colleges.

30. ELM test questions should be upgraded to reflect the increased high school preparation in mathematics now required for CSU admission.

31. In view of the cooperative efforts of the CSU and CCC, steps should be taken by the appropriate administrators to provide adequate and reasonable ELM testing dates to accommodate both systems, and that funding be provided so that the ELM test can be offered at a reasonable cost to students.

32. Because of the diversity from campus to campus, no coordination for other placement tests is necessary. Each campus should continue to develop its own math placement testing for individual courses as appropriate. We need, however, to share information about the nature and success of specific placement procedures with each other through regional meetings or possibly by means of an electronic bulletin board. The CSU/CCC campuses should consider agreeing on cut-off scores when the same test is used.

33. Regional conferences should be held for math faculties of the CSU and CCC to discuss placement exams, the ELM, and new math entrance requirements. These conferences should begin in the spring of 1988, with CSU campuses serving as hosts for their regions. Conference proceedings should be sent to area articulation officers and college presidents. Initial funding for such conferences could come from the present project.

Integration of English and Mathematics

34. Composition teachers should use materials that demand the development of analytical skills. Reading material should stress ideas, the "cognitive" domain rather than the "affective" domain which might be stressed in imaginative literature. Students should be required to write expository essays which require analysis, reasoning, and argument rather, than those essays which focus on narration and description alone.

35. Math instructors in both our systems should be encouraged to utilize more essay-type examinations (which require the student to explain a chain of reasoning), rather than relying only upon multiple-choice or single answer tests.

36. All composition classes, remedial and ESL in particular, should be small enough on both CCC and CSU campuses to allow for individualized instruction.

37. Until such time when four years of high school mathematics is made mandatory, college-bound students should be strongly urged to take four years of mathematics in high school.

38. Since success in basic G.E. math and English courses is fundamental to success in college, students should meet such general education requirements during their freshman year--before they take other courses requiring such skills.

39. Students who found to be deficient in reading, writing, or math skills, should complete remedial courses before they take other courses requiring such skills. In other words, remediation should precede college level work.

FRIDAY MORNING PLENARY SESSION

Address by Dr. John D. Randall,

Interim Chancellor,

The California Community Colleges

Frieda Stahl: Welcome

Good Morning. Yesterday was the heart of this conference. We devoted ourselves in two sessions and six pairs of groups to each of four concentrated issues: standards and expectations in English and mathematics, separately; transfer and articulation, together; placement and assessment, also separately for English and mathematics; and the integration of English and mathematics skills. Later this morning workshop leaders will present summaries of the outcomes of these discussions, including both perceptions of the problems, and recommendations for trial programs seeking solutions, or at least, improvements.

Karen Sue Grosz: Introduction of Chancellor Randall

In the Master Plan Commission study of higher education, the community colleges received special attention, a full year's worth of special attention, including a special report entitled, The Challenge of Change. Little did we know when that report was issued, just a little over a year ago, how much change we would have to challenge us. Not only do the community colleges confront the implications of AB1725, the omnibus reform legislation which will eliminate teaching credentials for community college faculty and move us more fully into the world of postsecondary education through that and other changes, but we also confront the effects of years of inadequate funding. In this swirling environment of challenge and change, we also have a new interim chancellor. Dr. John Randall understands the magnitude of these changes and is well-equipped to meet them. He has served 11 years as the President/Superintendent of the Mt. San Antonio College District, affectionately known in community college circles as Mt. Sac, and in that position has gained first-hand knowledge of the needs of community colleges. In addition, he chaired the organization of chief executive officers of the California Community Colleges, and in that position acquired a state-wide perspective of the range of concerns, special interests, and strengths of the colleges. Dr. Randall is a graduate of CSU, Long Beach, and earned his doctorate at the University of Southern California. Appropriately enough, his field is mathematics. Please join me in welcoming Chancellor John Randall.

Chancellor Randall's Address:

Thank you very much for that generous introduction, Karen. Karen mentioned these challenging times and you might well ask the question why someone would be foolish enough to take a job like mine during these times. I was asked several months ago if I might be interested in being interim chancellor, and I said that anyone who would do such a thing should have his head examined. I do have to leave here in twenty minutes--I have a psychiatrist's appointment--so I will make my remarks short!

It is indeed a pleasure to be here today at what I perceive to be a historic moment--the first bringing together of our respective faculties on a statewide basis to discuss academic issues of mutual concern. I understand that the last two days here have been very productive, and I have talked with several of you about your discussions; I hope that this is the first effort of continued cooperation between our two segments.

I must tell you I do feel right at home here with this group. I attended a community college, Long Beach City College, and then graduated from CSU, Long Beach, with a bachelor's and master's in mathematics, and I have taught in both places--at Cerritos College for several years and in the CSU system on a part-time basis. I still teach mathematics every several years. I teach a course when I can find the time, and I find it a very refreshing experience when you're dealing with budgets and all those kinds of things on a daily basis. To get into a classroom is very invigorating, and I commend that to any administrator who works in our system.

As a former mathematics teacher and as chancellor of a system that transfers some 45,000 students each year to CSU campuses, I am very interested in what will transpire as a result of this conference. I am hopeful that we will see some substantial recommendations for improving communication and cooperation between our faculties, as well as for clarifying academic standards and expectations for students. What has brought us together is the realization that as educators, we have the responsibility, not only to the students in our classrooms, but also to the students in other classrooms and in other institutions, all the way, really, from K-12 through graduate school. In the community college system we have articulation programs being developed extensively now with K-12 districts, and we feel that this is very valuable to our program. Equally important, and maybe even moreso for our transfer program, we are interested in doing the same thing with the University of California and the California State University. It is apparent that we can no longer afford the self-satisfied luxury of tending only our own store.

The faculty must be given the time, and must take the time, to discuss openly what they need from each other to make their own classroom teaching more effective. The changing demographics of our student population, the rapidity of technological change, the shifting of the economic scene, the growing influence of the Pacific Rim countries, and all the etceteras of a world undergoing a fascinating and yet intimidating change force us to communicate to one another about what is important to teach and what should be expected from all levels of instruction.

We owe it to our students to provide the highest quality education possible. We need to create an environment of confidence; confidence in what we teach will add value to our students who move from our twin institutions, as well as those who do not transfer. Students must have the confidence that they have been well-prepared for upper division courses and other advanced classes, and that their credits will be counted in other institutions. Obviously, this environment of confidence can be created only with the involvement of you, the faculty, who are not only the subject-matter experts, but who are also closely involved with students and understand their needs and expectations.

We have seen many efforts in recent years to improve communication among the segments of higher education. One such effort has been the California Education Round Table which is a forum of leaders in higher education and K-12, who meet to discuss academic and administrative policy issues. Some of the tasks which have been proposed for that Round Table, and I understand that you have discussed a few of those things earlier in this conference, are

1) to establish an agenda for researching methods to improve instruction and to reduce the dropout rates.

2) to consult among the segments regarding admission requirements and articulation--just what we are doing here.

3) to support cooperative curriculum development programs among all levels of education, K-Postsecondary.

You can see by these proposals that the Education Round Table can play a very important part in what we are trying to do here today.

In addition, as you heard yesterday morning, there exists an Inter-Coordinating Council (ICC) comprised of staff and faculty from each segment to provide operational support for Round Table activities. We are happy to have Mark Edelstein as the executive director of this Council.

There are other areas of cooperation that exist among the segments of higher education. For example, we have submitted to the Community Colleges an intersegmental budget proposal in the following transfer and articulation areas:

1) for intersegmental transfer centers;

2) for **Project Assist**, which is a computerized articulation project;

3) for CANS, the California Articulation Common Course Numbering System; and

4) for the 2+2+2 programs in vocational education.

We have requested $500,000 in 1988-89 to initiate this 2+2+2 program with the State University. These funds would allow us to create intersegmentally articulated vocational programs so that students can move easily from the high schools to the community colleges to the CSU.

Karen mentioned earlier the Community College reform bills that are before us--the Assembly Bill 1725, and the Report of the Commission on the Review of the Master Plan, and how these are going to affect the community colleges, the State University and education in general. I would like to talk about some of these areas of reform that have been proposed in these various studies.

As you know, the Master Plan Commission studied all of higher education and, in particular, the community colleges. It has published its recommendations and a joint legislative committee has formed legislation to carry out some of these recommendations. The proposed legislation does not deal with all of these recommendations, and some have been revised, but those which remain constitute AB #1725, a bill which pertains primarily to the community colleges. Although the bill will have a primary impact on the community colleges, there are also implications in it for the CSU.

Just a few of the highlights of this bill and some of the other recommendations. One is the mechanism for funding the community colleges. We are now funded on an ADA basis; we get money for students attending class. An hour in class gets x amount of dollars. There is no funding source for the other services which are provided. For example, there is no differential funding for one campus which has only 50 acres and two buildings to maintain and another campus which may have 400 acres and many, many buildings. As attendance patterns change, the cost of these buildings up does not change; legislators are looking for a funding source that would take care of this. It is called Programmed Based Funding rather than the ADA. We will be on a more equal funding basis with CSU in that regard.

Another very hot issue in the community colleges has to do with faculty staffing: the full-time/part-time issue. In many institutions, there are far too many part-time teachers; this means that there is not an adequate core of full-time faculty to do all the development necessary, to do long-range planning for the discipline, or to to engage in articualtion such as is going on at this conference. It is important that we decrease this ratio of part-time faculty to full-time faculty. Unfortunately, the only way of solving this problem is with money. This money is in AB #1725: the bill proposes that there will be an incentive for colleges which add more full-time teachers.

As a college president, I can speak to this issue: when you come to a money crunch, is the college president going to hire a full time person and then close down because of lack of money, or is he going to hire a part-time person and keep the doors open. Obviously, you are going to hire the part-time person. Karen mentioned the underfunding concept, and that is what has happened over the years. We are now proposing that 75 per cent of the classes be taught by full-time faculty and 25 per cent by part-time faculty. This seems a rather reasonable arrangement.

Another issue is credentials. Presently, in the community colleges, a faculty member must have a credential to teach. We are proposing that in lieu of credentials, we establish minimum standards for teachers. That is also included in AB #1725.

Length of tenure is also considered in the bill. Currently, community college tenure is granted after two years; the bill proposes that tenure be granted after four or five years. That will be a major change for us.

Another factor in the bill is governance, and for many that is the crucial part of the bill: who governs what? What do local boards of trustees do, how do they fit in with the State Board of Governors, and the Legislature? Who gets what power? AB #1725 has delineated what is going to happen on the local level and what will happen on the state level, but it hasn't determined what the Legislature is going to do and what the Board of Governors is going to do. I see that as the biggest issue in AB #1725.

Such provisions in the bill apply more directly to what this conference is about. The bill would require that the CSU, the UC, and the CCC create a common general-education, lower-division core curriculum to facilitate transfer. It would also require each segment to use the outcomes of these efforts as the ongoing basis for guaranteeing transfer to the senior segments. This is going to be a major task of articulation to get the three segments together to form a common core curriculum. It is hard enough to get two universities together, or two community colleges together. Although this is a very major task before us, I do think we can accomplish it with conferences such as this.

AB #1725 proposes that the core curriculum be completed by students in order to earn an associate's degree and transfer to a four year institution. This 60-unit course of study would apply to a transfer core curriculum of general education, various major requirements, and academic electives to make up the 60 units. Completion of these units would guarantee an automatic transfer of students to a four-year university. I think that is something we in the community colleges think is very necessary in order that we perform our main function, which is the transfer function.

Another issue which I did not mention--it is not in AB #1725 but is in the Master Plan recommendations--is the recommendation that UC and CSU control their enrollment so that they have 40 per cent lower division students and 60 per cent upper division students. Such an enrollment pattern would ensure that there would be openings for students from the community colleges to transfer to the UC and the CSU. Currently, that ratio is in effect in the CSU, but at UC this is not true. This is going to be a major problem in our efforts in the next several months to make sure that that ratio does remain. You understand that if there was something like a 50/50 ratio, there would be no opportunity for students to transfer, so in the CSU and UC segments we have to have a higher ratio of students in upper division. We must fight for this concept, and I hope that you will join us in this effort. This is a special interest of yours.

As you can see, AB #1725 and ongoing intersegmental activities relate significantly to the recommendations that will come out of this conference. Your ability to carry out your plans will be conditioned to a degree by the legislative requirements that will unfold in the coming year. Let me tell assure you, that we on the community college level are following those developments very closely, so that we will come out as well as the educational system in general does.

I know that many faculty lament the fact that so many seeming outsiders, such as administrators, legislators, and Long Beach or Sacramento bureaucrats are involved in policy making in their classroom. It is, of course, legitimate that such out-

siders play a role, but I think that we must all remember that the faculty plays the major role in the development of curriculum. I think that this fact has been recognized in the community colleges and in AB #1725, where the faculty is given more responsibility for the development of curriculum in the community colleges.

I am acutely aware that it is in the classroom that real changes occur. It is for this reason that I look forward to the results of the dialogue taking place in this historic conference, the first of its kind. And today I'd like to leave you with a quote by William Jennings Bryan. What he says speaks to the nature of the task before us. He wrote:

"Destiny is not a matter of chance, it is a matter of choice. It is not something to be waited for, but rather something to be achieved."

Thank you very much.

CLOSING PLENARY SESSION

Address by **W. Ann Reynolds,**

Chancellor,

The California State University

Frieda Stahl: Introduction of Chancellor Reynolds

Welcome again to our closing session and congratulations for a magnificent job. We hope to see this communication continue, regionally, interdisciplinarily, and intersegmentally.

It is again my personal and professional pleasure to introduce our California State University Chancellor, W. Ann Reynolds. She comes to us not only with chalk on her hands, but assorted chemicals as well, having had a stellar academic career in biology before her evolution into academic administration. She earned the Ph.D. in zoology at the University of Iowa, and has both taught and conducted basic and applied research in human biology. As I have learned by careful eavesdropping, when she needs to relax, her preferred mode of relaxation is bird-watching. Most apt for this conference on English and mathematics and their interrelationships is the fact that biologist Reynolds has worked very effectively to advance the fine and performing arts in the CSU. She has been CSU Chancellor for five years, and is the only woman to head so large a system of universities. She is also the current President of the National Council of Higher Education System Heads. She thus sets an elegant example for the future of women in academe. Please join me in welcoming CSU Chancellor, Ann Reynolds.

Chancellor Reynolds' Address:

Thank you, Professor Stahl.

I hear this conference has gone very well, and what I call the highest level of achievement is that you are all willing to do it again somewhere. I urge you to do so; you are all doing very important work, indeed.

In the book of Psalms it says, "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." (I would change that a little bit to read "brethren and sisters to dwell together in unity!") Many years from now, long after all of us have moved on to the great ivory tower in the sky, someone is going to write a book. Of itself, that may not sound like a monumental achievement; books get written everyday, and I'm sure that the books written by those of you in this room would make an impressive stack, and an impressive stack could be made from those underway. But this book is going to be about the history of education in California. It will no doubt mention the founding of the Califor-

nia State University, and the California Community Colleges, and, I suppose, it will have to mention the University of California! I suspect, though, that this book, more importantly, will talk about the millions of students we will have graduated, the advances we will together have made in education, and, most importantly, the way we together have shaped society, both for California and for the nation. If the author of this book is good and thorough, he or she will also mention on more than a few pages today's date, for today is truly a day rich in history: it marks an important new beginning in the relationship between the California State University and the California Community Colleges.

Whatever expectations you might have had in coming here to Napa, I think we all agree that it would be impossible to solve decades worth of confronting and confounding issues in a single three day conference, but you have truly taken that first big step and planted a very important seed. That may not seem like a big thing, but I believe that in future conferences we will be able to water and nurture it so that it grows to its fullest potential. When I think of this important first step that we have taken, I recall what scientist Michael Faraday said to Benjamin Disraeli. When Prime Minister Disraeli was shown a dynamo by Faraday, its inventor, Disraeli looked at this forerunner of all generators and said, "What good is this?" Faraday replied, "What good is a baby, Mr. Disraeli?"

Unfortunately, it is easy for all of us to get wrapped up in our own little worlds. It's easy to forget what other components are involved in keeping that world spinning. If nothing else were to come out of this conference, I hope that we have come to have a better understanding of each other and what we are trying to accomplish. We are, after all, the most earnest and serious of partners. It's a partnership that works well. At the CSU we receive 45,000 transfer students each year from the community colleges, and we are working very strongly to increase this number. For every one new freshman we enroll, we receive two students who are transferring from the California Community Colleges, and the majority of students who complete our teacher preparation programs are also community college transfers.

The linkage between our two institutions is absolutely critical for minority students. The community colleges have a large pool of minority students, potentially able to increase the baccalaureate degree completion rates of currently severely under-represented ethnic groups. The California Community Colleges and the California State University have a unique shared role in addressing and in helping to solve the emerging threat of a two-tiered California society. The growth of an undereducated underclass without access to the quality of life we have come to expect is an educational issue of highest priority to Californians. Students from underprivileged and under-represented groups traditionally gain access to higher education through the community colleges, and, more thoroughly we hope, through the CSU. We must take advantage of the opportunity our relationship provides to increase and improve the educational attainment of minorities and to promote equal access for society's benefit.

In its 1985 report, the California Post-Secondary Education Commission called for a reaffirmation of the community college transfer function and a recommitment to it by all segments of California post-secondary education. Similarly, the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan called the transfer function the cornerstone of post-secondary education in California. Transfer implies a sort of disjuncture in a student's education. I think that all of us want to think of a student's academic path as a progression, a continual progression through his or her young life to and through the bachelor's degree and beyond. The community colleges play an absolutely critical, pivotal, vital role in that progression. Since we at the CSU and you at the community colleges are working towards the same goal, I think that it is most appropriate that you have been here these days working together to assess and address the best ways to remove any obstacles that may stand in the way of students in their progression from community colleges to four year universities and their ultimate degree objectives.

You have been working on articulation, I'm sure, based on content mastery. The policies and procedures that address articulation are in place, administrative staffs are prepared to implement them, but the key element, as you well know, is agreement

between our mutual faculties. Curricular cohesion between the community colleges and the CSU won't happen unless it happens at the faculty level. Administrators can't make it happen, policies can't make it happen, but English instructors talking to English instructors, and math instructors talking to their counterparts can.

This conference is the first of what we hope will be many opportunities for faculty members to develop strong linkages with each other, so that students can have an academic experience that flows smoothly, free of any major disjuncture.

For agreement on pedagogy and curricular content our respective faculties simply have to know what the other one is doing. We can't be caught off guard. We don't want to be like the minister in my home town in Oklahoma who was out making his parochial rounds one day when he turned the street corner and observed a little girl jumping with all her might trying to reach a door knocker. He went over to her and said, "Allow me, my dear," and gave the door a sharp knock. The little girl then grinned as she turned on her heels and shouted, "Now, run like hell!" We can avoid embarrassing situations by knowing what the other person has in mind, and we can only find that out when we talk to each other.

Since the early 1970's, CSU system-wide policy has accorded to community colleges the authority to identify which courses meet CSU academic program objectives. This is a unique authority and responsibility. At the CSU, we accept these courses because we believe that the faculty, you the faculty, are the best qualified to evaluate course content. Content mastery is a faculty matter, and it should be at the very heart of articulation. For this to happen, we need to have a common, mutually understandable means to measure student performance. I hope that this is something that we can develop together in the coming years. And it is something that I have a great deal of anxiety about, incidently. I am eager for us to measure student performance, but in that sentence I said us, and I meant us collectively, the faculties. We are going to continue to see well-meaning people at the legislative level, and well-meaning educators out to make a national name for themselves, groups that prepare exams for whom this is a very fiscally rewarding opportunity, leap off on this. There is so much more to assessing what a student has learned in the first and second years at Rio Hondo, or what he or she has learned at the third and fourth years at Stanislaus than passing a written test. And to determine that--and I think we can do much more to determine that--you people are absolutely critical. It's my job to stave off some of these other outside influences, but in order for us to do that you must have an opportunity to function on that very important assessment question.

You have had the chance over the past few days to discuss curriculum standards and expectations, issues of transfer and articulation, strategies for assessment and placement, and the integration of English and mathematics skills. I understand, too, that the English people didn't all go over to one side of the room and the mathematicians didn't all go find a blackboard, and not talk to each other, but that you truly did speak to one another, and that is marvelous. I hope that these discussions are just the first of many more that will follow and that out of your discussions this week there will be a movement toward more intercollegiate alliances and regional consortia. Whatever recommendations that you have made, you should know that money has been set aside for spin-offs from this conference. It's not a lot of money, mind you, but I believe that these modest resources can support many of the suggestions that you have developed.

When Henry Ford was once asked by an ambitious young employee, "How can I make my life a success?" Mr. Ford's reply was very simple: "When you start a thing, finish it." We've started a very important movement this week; it is now up to all of us to see that we finish it. If we do, the success we enjoy will be shared by hundreds of thousands of students who will benefit from a smoother academic pathway, and, most importantly, achieve their goals. I thank you for taking the time to come here. You have spent a long, arduous two and a half days. I'm eager to work with you to take those ideas and put them to work. Thank you.

Questions from the audience:

1. *One of the issues that came up in several discussions that I participated in had to do with the relationship of class size to standards and expectations in both English and math classes. But whenever we talk about class size there is an interesting conflict, because on the one hand we are talking about an important curricular matter, and, on the other hand, we are talking about a workload/collective bargaining dispute. That conflict always seems to close the door on that discussion. Can you offer any suggestions?*

Since I first came to California, I've been concerned about that same issue. In the CSU we have been inhibited from doing creative things that would help our class size problem, partly by facilities. If you remember, our campuses were built with a rubber-stamp size for classrooms; they are all virtually the same size. It creates a situation that does not allow us much flexibility, and it really forces our faculty into teaching the same size class, and a fairly good size class, year-in and year-out. We are moving very strongly now in our capital outlay program to deal with the facilities problem. The facilities problem has been really bad in that respect. In every new building, or every building that is renovated throughout the system, we do four things: we put in more single faculty offices, we put in large lecture halls that will seat 100 or more, (the third I can't remember just now), the fourth is that we put in more ladies' rest rooms. I hasten to say that we are not moving to all large lecture rooms; I would like a situation where we can have large lectures when appropriate and also small seminars.

I want to add to the second part of your question regarding faculty workload; we have an internal study group working on that issue and it involves our collective bargaining people as well. We want to make sure that the CFA leadership is involved in that planning and that process from the beginning; it will actually benefit everybody in the long run. It is a very important issue, and I'm glad you brought it up.

2. *There has ben a lot of talk lately about outcome assessment and tying funding to outcome assessment. Obviously, Senator Hayden and others are very interested in this, and it has been tried in a number of other states, and with some success in a state like Tennessee. What is your opinion of this, and what is your evaluation of the political likelihood of some sort of intersegmental outcomes assessment?*

That is what I was referring to obliquely in my remarks. I am very straightforward about that. We hosted a conference about a year ago with Mr. Hayden; in any event that issue came up. Both David Gardener and I said to Mr. Hayden very frankly that that approach to funding is not respectable academically. I don't think that it will work, I am opposed to it, and I think that it is harmful to students. We hosted a conference on assessment at Pomona about a year ago which emphasized the kind of assessment that is more individually based. We take a student when he is coming in and attempt, with a variety of parameters, to discover where that student is; we try to pinpoint deficiencies and we try to pinpoint strengths and bring that student along while constantly assessing and reevaluating the student's progress so that we know where that student is by the time he or she finishes whatever segment of higher education they are pursuing. I think assessment needs to be faculty based. What Mr. Hayden is talking about are large scale massive exams and you fund the campuses for the greatest achievement. I just feel that is terribly naive. The experiments which have been conducted in some of the other states have not been effective either.

Frieda Stahl:

Thank you very much Chancellor Reynolds.

On behalf of the planning committee we thank you all for the enthusiasm, the verve, and the creativity that you have fed into this conference. We have achieved other kinds of transfer in addition to the transfer we talked about: we have transferred some ideas to one another, and we have welded math and English and come up with a criterion for analytical studies and for critical thinking. Above all, we

learned of such things as ordinary differential equations and extraordinary literature. We look forward to your continuing this good work. Thank you again.

APPENDIX

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

English Participants from the California Community Colleges:

Barbara Bilson, Santa Monica College
Edith Conn, Ventura College
Mary Ann Cox, San Joaquin Delta College
Muriel Davis, San Diego Mesa College
Ginger DeBow, San Joaquin Delta College
Gordon Dossett, Santa Monica College
Mark Edelstein, Palomar College
Karen Sue Grosz, Santa Monica College
Jewel Keusder, Cypress College
Jonah LaRouche, Allan Hancock College
Alicia Lackman, Long Beach City College
Veloris Lang, Glendale College
Dorothy Menzel, Napa Valley College
Lynda Myers, Mendocino College
Bob Mognis, Modesto Junior College
Rose Najar, East Los Angeles College
Lois Powers, Fullerton College
Jim Prager, Yuba College
Robert Rippy, San Bernardino Valley College
Jim Rustin, Fresno City College
Judith Salzinski, Orange Coast College
Rod Siegfried, American River College
Mark Snowhite, Crafton Hills College
Nina Theiss, Santa Monica College
Lloyd Thomas, Los Angeles Community College District
Hannie J. Voyles, Butte College

English Participants from the California State University:

Rise Axelrod, CSU, San Bernardino
Edward Borowiec, CSU, Long Beach
Robert Carlisle, CSC, Bakersfield
Roberta Ching, CSU, Sacramento
Robert Coleman, Sonoma State University
Mary Cullinan, CSU, Hayward
Thomas Fox, CSU, Chico
John Galm, San Jose State University
Rosemary Hake, CSU, Los Angeles
Allison Heisch, San Jose State University
Thomas Klammer, CSU, Fullerton
Gale Larson, CSU, Northridge
Charles May, CSU, Long Beach
Daniel McLeod, San Diego State University
Robert Noreen, CSU, Northridge
Linda Palmer, CSU, Sacramento
Mona Rosenman, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo
George Settera, CSU, Stanislaus
Thia Wolf, CSU, Northridge
Agnes Yamada, CSU, Dominguez Hills

Mathematics Participants from California Community Colleges:

Richard Aufmann, Palomar College
Chris Burditt, Napa Valley College
Guy DePrimo, San Francisco City College
Art Dull, Diablo Valley College
Wade Ellis, Jr., West Valley College
David Foster, Lassen College
David Horowitz, Golden West College
Margaret Lial, American River College
Pat McKeague, Cuesta College
Bill New, Cerritos Community College
Larry Reynolds, Yuba College
John Schaeffer, College of the Sequoias
Ken Seydel, Skyline College
Martha Sklar, Los Angeles City College
Cynthia Speed, Mendocino College
Gerald Stein, Merced Community College
Sally Thomas, Orange Coast College
Darrell Top, Modesto Junior College
Shirley Trembley, Bakersfield College
Jean Vincenzi, Saddleback College
Tania Volhontseff, Santa Rosa Junior College
Ann Watkins, Los Angeles Pierce College
Raymond Wuco, San Joaquin Delta College
Lois Yamakoshi, Los Medanos College

Mathematics Participants from the California State University:

Ruth Afflack, CSU, Long Beach
Mike Bossert, CSU, Sacramento
Marshall Cates, CSU, Los Angeles
Jean Chan, Sonoma State University
Art DeKleine, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo
Phillip Emig, CSU, Northridge
Newman Fisher, San Francisco State University
James Friel, CSU, Fullerton
Merle Friel, Humboldt State University
Herbert Gindler, San Diego State University
Jackson Henry, CSU, Dominguez Hills
Eunice Krinsky, CSU, Dominguez Hills
Elena Marchisotto, CSU, Northridge
Lilian Metlitsky, Cal Poly, Pomona
John Mitchem, San Jose State University
Elmo Moore, Humboldt State Univesity
David Pagni, CSU, Fullerton
Ken Rebman, CSU, Hayward
Everett Riggle, CSU, CHico
John Sarli, CSU, San Bernardino
Frank Sheehan, San Francisco State University
Merriline Smith, Cal Poly, Pomona
Robert Stein, CSU, San Bernardino
Viji Sundar, CSU, Stanislaus
Laird Taylor, CSC, Bakersfield

Other Participants:

Connie Anderson, Chancellor's Office, CCC
Nancy Glock, Chancellor's Office, CCC
Lee Kerschner, Chancellor's Office, CSU
Stephanie Adams McGraw, Chancellor's Office, CSU
John D. Randall, Interim Chancellor, California Community Colleges
W. Ann Reynolds, Chancellor, The California State University
Ken Simms, Chancellor's Office, CSU
Frieda Stahl, CSU, Los Angeles and Academic Senate, CSU
Stu Van Horn, Mt. San Antonio College
Stephanie Whan, Chancellor's Office, CSU
Frank Young, Chancellor's Office, CSU

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PRE-CONFERENCE READINGS

Conferees came well-prepared to discuss the issues in the disciplines of English and mathematics which confront the California State University and the California Community Colleges. Prior to the conference, participants were sent several documents for study and review:

The Challenge of Change: A Reassessment of the California Community Colleges. Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, Sacramento, March 1986.

Considerations Involved in Determining What Constitutes a Baccalaureate Level Course, An Intersegmental Academic Senate Statement of Recommended Policy, endorsed by CSU Academic Senate, May 1987.

Focus on Mathematics: The Entry Level Mathematics Examination. The California State University, Long Beach.

Focus on English: The English Placement Test. The California State University, Long Beach.

1986-87 Handbook of California Articulation Policies and Procedures. Articulation Council of California, Long Beach, 1986.

The Master Plan Renewed: Unity, Equity, Quality, and Efficiency in California Postsecondary Education. Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, Sacramento, July 1987.

Statement on Competencies in English and Mathematics Expected of Entering Freshmen, developed by the Academic Senates of UC, CSU, and the Community Colleges, distributed by the California Round Table on Educational Opportunity, November 1982.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges JUL 01 1988